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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes the prevalence of dementia and related disorders among those referred for a forensic psychiatric examination in Sweden. This is of interest with few other studies on the topic. They paper may be improved as follows:

Results:

- Start with a demographics table including MMSE score, any other quantitative psychometric or functional measure

- Diagnosis should be table 2

- Previous and current crimes: was dementia considered in those with previous crimes?

- Describe which abnormalities were present on neuroimaging and EEG

- Results: what means with/without separate discharge review?

- Table 1 Comorbidities table can be added to the supplement and conditions relevant for the diagnosis or crime can be mentioned in the text

- Table 2 can be added to the supplement- any medication relevant for the diagnosis or crime can be mentioned in the text
Discussion:

- Discuss the legal implication of the examination for the patients

Abstract:

- Results: start with age and gender, type of crime, followed by diagnosis. Summarize as follows: primary alcohol or substance abuse n=6, primary vascular: n=5; AD n=2, Parkinson, herpes simplex, delusional disorder all 1, not specified: 5

- Mention impact on legal outcome

- Remove the comment on the prevalence of AD in the general population and comment of professions

- Discussion: mention the low prevalence of dementia in the population, the fact that most were related to alcohol.

Other comments

- "...statistics were not needed": replace by were not performed.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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