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Reviewer's report:

This is a valuable review for the environmental risk factors for dementia. The paper is well written in general. I would like to recommend it for publication. However, I hope the authors could address the following minor issues to improve this study.

1. The background part needs to be extended. It seems necessary to highlight more about the role of environmental factors among the different types of risk factors.

2. Citations are needed for "we also included factors not included in the general list which we knew had been linked to dementia risk, such as trace elements" at Page 4, 14-19.

3. More clarifications are needed for the statement, "however, if a review reported multiple new studies, we included the review as a single source of evidence" at Page 5, 9-13. Are you saying that you will use the review conclusion as the "single" evidence?

4. In Table 1, please consider moving down "Aluminium (occupational exposure)" to occupational exposure, or moving up "Lead (occupational exposure)" and "Metals (occupational exposure)" to "Other metals" The current classification seems not consistent.

5. Citations are needed for "one prospective study and the larger cross-sectional studies tend to support an association between aluminium and dementia risk" at Page 10, 34-39.

6. Give specific study information for "the fact that a number of exposures were only studied in a single study also weakens support for them as it is impossible to examine the consistency of the association in multiple studies" at Page 15, 33-39.

7. I suggest mentioning and introducing about the two previous reviews at "Comparison with previous literature" at the background, and then revisiting these two papers at the conclusion.
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