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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor(s)

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the reviewers comments for the below named manuscript which we resubmit for your consideration for publication to TRIALS.

Tailored educational intervention for primary care to improve the management of dementia: The EVIDEM-ED cluster Randomised Controlled Trial.

The responses to the comments and associated page numbers where changes have been made are shown in the tables below.

I hereby certify that this paper consists of original, unpublished work which is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

The manuscript with track changes turned on has been re-submitted via the online system.

Yours Faithfully,

Jane Wilcock (Corresponding Author) with
Steve Iliffe, Mark Griffin, Priya Jain, Ingela Thuné-Boyle, Frances Lefford & David Rapp

(Please see attached document as amendments have been detailed in a table with footnotes which have lost their formatting below)

Reviewer 1 points addressed: Pages

Major compulsory revisions:
Detail has been added about the intervention development and delivery 7 & 12 & box 1
The following questions have been addressed:

1. What findings from the pilot led to decisions about the nature and duration of the intervention and who would be able to deliver it in practice? 14
2. Who actually delivered the intervention at each participating site and to what extent did this differ across sites? 142
3. To what extent did those who received the intervention vary across sites as well as the proportion of clinicians that were trained and those that opted out? 14

Minor essential revisions:

- More clarification about the limitations of intervention development and how these could be ameliorated. 16
- Clarification regarding use of co-design and/or nominal group techniques. 20, additional references added
- Misquote reference 15 amended. 32

Reviewer 2 points addressed: Pages

- The order of methods could be clarified.
- Was other data collected? Page 21 and within fig. 1
- How was the education monitored? 16
- Did all practices attend all sessions? 16

The audit of medical records and main outcome seems difficult to replicate, perhaps the audit instrument could be included in an appendix? The audit instrument is not included as a separate appendix as these are defined in Table 1 and on page 9, 10 & as bullet points on page 11 within the article. The method of collecting practice level data should be included.

The method of collecting patient level data should be included (age & gender) 13

Suggestions for discussion:

- One could add that the payment incentives and roll out of dementia guidelines may well have caused change in both arms Already noted page 21
- Possibility of being underpowered, a 50% change is a lot to ask 21
- Greater discussion of what other changes and outcomes may have been impacted but were not measured, i.e. staff and patient satisfaction with care 2112