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Reviewer’s report:

RE: Prevalence Characteristics and Correlates of a Positive-Dementia Screen in Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy in Bamenda, Cameroon

I appreciate the opportunity to review this very interesting article. I think the study was relatively straight forward with no untoward surprises. The literature review was adequate, the sample size and recruitment process were acceptable, and the statistical analysis seem ok. Below are some comments and suggestions that may help with revising or improving the article further.

1. On page 10 at the bottom, I assume the authors meant “than” instead of “that”.
2. Could the authors provide a number as to how many of their participants were on HAART? Such information would help provide a context in which to better interpret the results.
3. Could the authors comment on how these “demented” adults function in everyday life? These are individuals who consented to the study and negotiated their environment to come Bamenda Hospital. It seems highly unlikely that these individuals are truly “demented”; perhaps they have Mild Cognitive Impairment or peripheral neuropathy that account for the poor functioning scores on the IHDS which has a big psychomotor performance component that may obscure the true higher-order cognitive functioning.
4. This is a point of preference and clarity, but in my opinion Tables should be able to stand alone from the text. Given that premise, I think it would be a good idea to spell out the acronyms (i.e., IHDS, CI, REF) in the notes section at the bottom of the tables.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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