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Reviewer's report:

This is a fairly straightforward descriptive study of a case series of people with dementia and cognitive impairment assessed by Swedish forensic examiners. The most notable findings are that there is a small number of such cases; most did not however have a prior diagnosis; alcohol misuse was very common whereas a diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease was uncommon; and other evidence of brain dysfunction (head injury, stroke, epilepsy) was quite common too.

There is not much to object to methodologically. The limitations of the sampling have been discussed. The age range of the sample starts at 35 and no-one was aged >77, which suggests that either older people with dementia don't commit crimes of violence or else they are dealt with without a forensic assessment of this kind.

It isn't clear what the implications for practice from these findings might be. perhaps the authors should add some thoughts about how this should inform forensic practice.

Finally, I would change the title. 'Dementia as a result of a forensic psychiatric examination' implies literally that the examination CAUSES the dementia, which is unlikely. And it ignores the 4/21 individuals who had cognitive impairment but not dementia. 'Dementia and cognitive impairment identified at a forensic psychiatric examination' would be more suitable.
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