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Reviewer's report:

This is an important study however I have some concerns, mainly about the methods used.

Please describe: 35-42 % had a diagnosis of dementia prior to enrollment (was it found in the medical records?)

Its a bit confusing when Table 2 shows other numbers than the above (SPMSQ 6-7=(probably not a diagnosis of dementia)

Table 2 shows that the control group had more patients in group 8-10 compared (51->57) to baseline and to the intervention group (58-49). It was better result for the control group?

In Table 3 was the group with SPMSQ 0-2 "the dementia group", could you please explain your subgroups and their definitions. Because your conclusion is drawn from the fact that you suddenly compare the group with 0-2 to all the other patients (instead of 0-2 and 3-5)

Could you please describe more about the given FICB, the technique and how many persons were included in this.

The dose given in mg, Robivacain and was it adjusted to the weight of the person.

is it possible to add the hours between the given FICB and the the second measurement of SPMSQ, probably this is of importance...?

Adjustments for fracture type? A patient with an undisplayed fracture has less pain compared to displaced fractures.

Use patients with hip fractures (instead of hip fracture patients)

Hip fracture repair - > surgery?

Check the references and use numbers consistently
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.

Yes

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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