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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   This paper describes the development of an intervention
   “This paper reports the development of an educational needs assessment tool to guide tailored educational interventions designed to enhance early diagnosis and management of dementia in primary care, for the EVIDEM-ED randomised controlled trial”
   rather than the trial design. As such it is well written and informative and sets out the rationale for the intervention and the process by which it was developed involving an expert group and an expert panel and reports the participation of the first 5 practices.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes this is a very detailed account of the theory underlying the educational prescription approach to dementia education at a practice level. The implementation is was at the pilot stage and adaptation was made at the individual practice level and to the overall approach.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   The results as such is the process the 5 pilot practices took to the intervention and are presented in a table. One more indepth example is provided.
   The 4 tables are all informative and the box of a sample practice ENA process is very usefull for those wanting to understand how this intervention works.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes these is adequate detail

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes the title is accurate and the abstract succinct and informative

7. Is the writing acceptable? The writing is of a very high standard, apart from the already noted typographical errors.
categories:
- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
  This article is acceptable as submitted
- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
  The format of the table headings needs some attention as the text wrapping makes difficult reading

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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