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Reviewer’s report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Please see comments below

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. More information on how individuals were recruited to participate in the study is need. I realize the authors cite a protocol paper that presumably contains some of this info, but the current manuscript should provide a bit more info so that it can stand alone.

2. Is this list of outcomes specific to the UK setting or can it be applied cross nationally?

3. The literature search was limited to the ALOIS database. I am not familiar with this database and it is unclear how studies enter the database. A more comprehensive search should be conducted of existing databases (e.g., embase and medline).

4. The specific key words and search terms used to search the database should be provided.

5. Data was extracted from 50% of the identified studies. Some validation work should be done against the studies that were not extracted to ensure the 50% sample is representative of the entire literature.

6. It is unclear why costs and economic outcomes were excluded from the list of outcomes.

7. I question if excluding caregiver outcomes is a reasonable assumption. Most community based dementia interventions also impact caregivers. A separate list of caregiver outcomes should be considered. If not for this manuscript, then the authors should note that this will be done for a future analysis.

8. The discussion should comment a bit more on the connection between these outcomes and specific measures. While inconsistencies in the collection and reporting of outcomes is a challenge another major challenge is measurement of each outcome. The authors have a great opportunity to not only report the key concepts but also provide some inventory on the measures that can be used to capture the outcomes.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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