

Reviewer's report

Title: Discomfort and agitation in older adults with dementia

Version: 2 Date: 2 May 2007

Reviewer: Martha Buffum

Reviewer's report:

General

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

None. Nice job!

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

1. It is not clear whether a two week rating period comprised the data collection period. This needs clarity in the abstract and in the narrative. RNs were given 2 weeks, but it was not clear whether they needed the 2 weeks for completing the CMAI or whether they were simply given a due date by which to respond.

2. Word usage and grammar:

pg. 4 Background, para 2: delusion should be delusions

pg. 6 4 lines from the top: eliminate the "a" before "painful chronic or acute ailments" would read better if stated: "painful acute or chronic ailments"

pg. 6 next paragraph, in 2 places, change to "e.g.," from "e.g.:"

pg. 7 Methods. Participants. Clarify the data collection period as mentioned above

pg. 10 Procedure. 1st para Change needed: "RNs working on the residents' units were asked to participate in" rather than "to collaborate on"

pg. 10 Procedure. 2nd para, clarify: two weeks to complete and return (specify that the CMAI requires two weeks)

pg. 10 Procedure. 3rd para, 3rd line down, change needed: "the residents themselves did not participate directly in the data collection" instead of "to the data collection"

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors did an exceptionally fine job in responding to concerns and requests for changes. The article reads much better.

1. The hypotheses that are stated nicely in the goal statement are not addressed in the results or the discussion. They should be re-stated in the results section and then the actual finding should be described. As is, the regression results are presented and they are complex. (RNs would not be able to understand that section, so it would be ideal to simplify by at least re-presenting the hypotheses and the findings under them.)

2. Because the topic is important to clinical care, it would be helpful to include some clinical implications of this work. Also, what do the authors recommend as the next research steps?

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests.