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Reviewer's report:

This is an important issue and you have covered it comprehensively. Your conclusions are valid and identify the important issues.

To improve the article for your readers you may wish to address these issues-

1. Clarify that you included rehab in acute medical units- ie not just after transfer to GEM/Aged Rehab units

2. How exactly was a response to the intervention defined?- absolute change, percentage change, change in x of y variables (and how was that defined) etc. Look at Paul Maruff’s work in the dementia field for some suggestions.

3. Best not to use the term "geriatric patients"- there are more pc terms.

4. Are you sure all relevant literature has been accessed? This reviewer is co-author on a paper that seems to have been missed.

5. There are some English errors- eg line 96 on page 5.

6. Please clarify that you have included rehab in acute medical units, rather than transfer to other units.

7. Your prevalence of cognitive impairment/dementia is low- suggesting, as is common, that ascertainment was incomplete- and this would affect input and output values. Please clarify/expand.

8. On page 22, lines 582 on, you have included discussion on results- please move to appropriate section.

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

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

Unable to assess

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:
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