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Reviewer's report:

Comments on 'The Low Indexes of Metabolism Intervention Trial (LIMIT): Design and initial results of a randomized controlled clinical trial to evaluate how alerting primary care teams to low metabolic values, would affect the health of patients aged 75 or older'

The authors in this paper simply described their participants and reported the baseline measures. How useful they are I am not sure.

Their primary outcome was death from any cause within one year; however, there is no comparison or report of the outcome.

In table 1, they suggested using chi-squared test for comparing deaths between intervention and controls. In table 1, there are some baseline differences between two groups, therefore authors should adjust for those differences and then compare the proportion of deaths between two groups using an appropriate statistical method such as logistic regression. Several outcomes in table 1 are not continuous, for example dispensed anti-diabetic drugs in criterion b patients, emergency room visits etc. Using nonparametric test or regression methods for count data are more appropriate for comparing this type of data than a t-test. The underlying assumption in t-test is that the data is normally distributed and this condition must be examined before t-test is applied.

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.

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:
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