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**Reviewer's report:**

I read the article with interest as it applies the 10/66 protocol in a high-income European setting. It is a well written article and I have minor suggestions for the authors consideration.

1. The sample needs to be better described in terms of identification. How were those older than 65 years identified in the community? Was it through some administartive database or through enumeration of each household? The authors state that the informants were appointed. Who appointed them and using what criteria?

2. The authors state that nursing home residents were excluded and then go on to describe this group in various sections of the article. I suggest they remove it entirely or use it to do some sensitivity analysis or prediction of prevalence of dementia in nursing home dwelling older adults.

3. Questionnaires/questions determining dementia subtypes and CDR need to be better defined.

4. The authors need to define the qualifications/ experience of the 'mental health professionals' who conducted the study.

**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.
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