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Reviewer’s report:

General
Dear editor

Thank you for the opportunity you gave me to review this interesting paper. This study is potentially suitable for publication but not before the authors perform some changes.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

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

1. The title is misleading, since the study populations are not representative neither of the general population nor of institutionalized patients in particular.
2. Background. There are many papers especially from European countries both concerning epidemiology and Risk factors. The authors should rewrite the ‘background’.
3. We need a description of what exactly is a ‘senior center’
4. The numbers concerning the study population should be mentioned earlier and more clearly.
5. The method of data collection is inadequately described. I would suggest the authors include the protocol in an appendix.
6. Is MMSE validated in Mexico?
7. Which laboratory tests were performed?
8. What the authors mean by ‘evidence of cerebrovascular disease’?
9. The writing should be improved and become more structured.
10. The statistical analysis is problematic. I would suggest the authors should use MANCOVA with gender and age as covariates instead of t-test. Bonferroni correction is necessary. I would recommend they ask a statistician.
11. Since there is a great imbalance concerning the composition of the sample in terms of gender, the authors should include a cross-tabulation presentation of the sample.
12. Too few were smokers. Is this usual in Mexico? Is it a gender effect?
13. Too many were never married. The authors should comment this.
14. How does history of unemployment relate to the diagnosis?
15. How about low education as a confounding variable (for journeymen)?
16. Overall the results agree with previous work done by my group.

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.
Level of interest: A paper of considerable merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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