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Reviewer's report:

This paper reports the preliminary work to develop a complex educational intervention to facilitate increased diagnosis of dementia by GPs. The intervention is based upon the theory of educational prescriptions and builds upon earlier work for the team demonstrating improvements in practice from related primary care educational resources. I would be happy to support publication; the development and feasibility of such complex, yet pragmatic, interventions is worthy of dissemination prior to publication of results on their effectiveness and acceptability. However I would require the following comments to be addressed (Minor essential revisions).

Introduction: More detail on the theory, origins and known evidence to date on educational prescriptions would be helpful to the reader; information of their effectiveness todate may however be better placed in the discussion section.

Methods: A co-design approach was adopted - how are such interventions usually fdeveloped, by this means or other methods? Clarity here would be helpful.

A flow chart summarising the development and refinement process would assess the reader as although the methods section is helpfully detailed, a summary of this would assist.

Can the authors provide any detail about the skill mix needed of the practice facilitators/expert tutors - eg do they need to be dementia experts or just expert group facilitators? Were different professionals used or the same facilitators?

Box 1 is very detailed - can this be summarised with bullet points and key quotes?

Discussion: A concise summary and review of limitations provided but I was left with little understanding of the theoretical context of educational prescriptions and how effective these have been in other circumstances and setttings. This needs to be addressed.

The references need to be sorted out and in a consistent format.
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