

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Effect of educational intervention on medication timing in Parkinson's disease: a randomized controlled trial

**Version: 5 Date:** 28 March 2007

**Reviewer:** Carmel M Hughes

### Reviewer's report:

General

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

There are still a couple of things which are outstanding. When I reread the method, it is now apparent that randomisation preceded baseline data collection and issuing of MEMS bottles. This could have introduced a degree of bias. In their response to the other reviewer, the authors indicated that clinical scoring was done by a clinic nurse who was blind to the purpose of the study. Did this same nurse collect baseline data? This would have helped matters somewhat.

I had previously queried the rationale for the pre-intervention phase and in their response, the authors stated that this was done to record baseline timing adherence. However, on page 5 of the revised manuscript, they state that 'at the time of the intervention, individual baseline MEMS results were not known'. Is this not a contradiction?

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.