Reviewer's report

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

Version: 2 Date: 28 August 2013

Reviewer: Ngaire Kerse

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes the question is well defined and the introduction provides good background to the context and the previous pilot.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   The order of the methods could be clarified. All sections are there and the information is detailed, but the only measures outlined are the dementia cases. Was other data collected. How was the education monitored? Did all practices attend all sessions?
   The audit of medical records and main outcome seems difficult to replicate, perhaps the audit instrument could be included in an appendix.
   The method of collecting practice level data should be included.
   The method of collecting patient level data should be included m(age and gender).
   The analysis is I believe appropriate

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Yes, the trial design is robust and data are reported in a way that is easily interpreted

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

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes the discussion is succinct
   One could add that the payment incentives and roll out of demetia guidelines as a background thing may well have caused change in both arms.
   There is also the possibility of being underpowered, a 50% change is a lot to ask. There was definitely no impact of the intervention as stated.
   I also wonder a brief discussion (more then the sentence there) of what oterh
changes or outcomes may have been impacted but were not measured, ? staff and patient satisfaction with care for instance.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
yes

2. Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

3. Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Addition of the method of practice and patient level data collection.

4. Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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