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Reviewer's report:

1 The manuscript describes the evaluation of the implementation of a monodisciplinary approach for challenging behaviour in dementia. Why did the authors choose for a monodisciplinary approach and not for a multidisciplinary approach which is the standard approach for challenging behaviour in dementia (Zwijsen et al, 2014; Pieper et al, 2018)?

2 R150-155 The authors describe five triggers for analysing challenging behaviour. On the basis of which model or theory were these triggers chosen and why not for instance physical discomfort (pain), or unmet needs?

How did the analysis work and what kind of hypotheses were drawn up? A short example could help.

3 I miss the involvement of the client and his/her family in the decision making process. Please comment on that topic.

4 R87 The study is part of a larger study with an RCT into the effectiveness of the intervention. For this manuscript and for the implications for practice it could be interesting to know something about the effectiveness of the intervention.

5 Method R116/117: The authors state that this report follows COREQ? I do not recognize the COREQ criteria in the manuscript. Is it possible to add a table with the criteria and how they have been met in an appendix?

6 R194 How were the participants of the RCT selected? Were there any refusals?

7 Is it possible to conduct telephonic semi-structured interviews in 15 minutes? How do you ensure sufficient depth? Give an overview of the themes of the semi-structured interviews and the focus groups.

8 Is it possible to add a description of the coding tree?

9 The reasons for adoption or adaptation are not always described. This can be important for adjusting the intervention in the future.
10 R322-329 the dominating person of the other nursing team: is this a disadvantage of the composition of the case conference or a task of the moderator?

11 R334 Are there also advantages reported of participation of staff from other teams by nursing staff? Did they reflect on their own role as nurse from another team in the case conference?

12 Discussion: The discussion is quite long with a lot of repetition. I would like to have a reflection on wether there are limits to the adaptation of the intervention or not. Add clear implications for practice (adaptation of the intervention), for education and for research.

13 Conclusion: is very general. Give a more detailed answer on the research question.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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