**Response to reviewers of “Learning opportunities in the 'Golden Years' in a regional city”**

I thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and input into improving the paper.

I have accepted all the minor changes indicated in the reviewer’s tracking (punctuation etc.).

In response to the comments (as numbered on the manuscript), I have

1: provided some examples;

2: removed a repetitive bit on p. 4;

3 & 4: in the *Methods* section provided more details of how organisations were identified and approached;

5 & 6: given more details of the questions, including the actual questions apart from purely demographic ones, and the analysis of responses;

7: the importance of providing alternative ways for men to access health information was spelled out;

8: comparison of metropolitan and non-metropolitan learning needs was included in the discussion;

9: I was somewhat surprised by the reviewer’s comment, “The references to SPERA seems a little gratuitous and offered more as a justification for why this work should be published by SPERA.” After all, the first version of the paper was compiled for a 2014 SPERA Conference presentation. However, I have shortened that section a little, and also omitted references such as to the conference theme. I think I would still have wanted to mention SPERA had I been writing for another organisation, albeit with more explanation of what it stands for.

10, 11, 12: Reference glitches have been corrected.

Responses to other review comments:

I have reorganised parts of the paper in order to better deal with the comments made.

* I’ve shifted the table to an **Appendix**.
* Instead of the original **Importance and future directions** section, I’ve concentrated on putting some material from elsewhere into a **Discussion** section where it is probably more appropriate, retaining a **Future directions** section after it.

I have tried to be more explicit about the benefits of third age learning for wellbeing and social inclusion.

I have not so far been able to identify the proportion of the community that have home Internet access and requisite skills – but in any case, it could be said that there is access for all via the public library, and there are opportunities, as mentioned in the paper, for upskilling through classes available. (I was talking to someone today who teaches such a class – he himself does not have the Internet at home, as he cannot afford it, he said. I wanted to e-mail him something, and he said he would get it in several days’ time, when he is next at the class location!)

Some details have been given about the issue of addressing gaps, and survey responses concerning collaboration with UniSA were described – such collaboration is not a one-way ideal.

A comment and reference relating to the advantages of qualitative approaches were included under *Methods*.

Referencing corrections: apart from those mentioned above, dates of newspaper articles in the reference list have been made consistent in form.

Other changes

The abstract has been modified to reflect some changes. For example, there is now no reference in the paper to the current project relating to music learning activities – this will be written up at the conclusion of the project.

Additional references are Blessinger; Delors; Mack et al.

References have been deleted where condensing removed the in-text citation.

A reference to the International Day of Older Persons – the day the conference paper was delivered – was deleted.

Findings concerning the individual members’ learning goals (described in an earlier paper) were briefly summed up.

Acknowledgements have been added.

Please let me know if there is anything further that I should attend to.

Kind regards

Bronwyn