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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript addresses the interesting point of sensitivity and specificity of the shortened version of the BRB compared to the extensive neuropsychological evaluation of patients with MS. Authors conclude that, although the whole shortened version (SRT, SDMT and SRT) has reasonable sensitivity and specificity, single tests should not be used in isolation.

Also authors explain correctly the procedure they followed and the extensive neuropsychological evaluation they used as gold standard.

In my opinion, some comments need to be done.

In the introduction more comments on the fact that the full BRB is more sensitive than the extensive neuropsychological evaluation described by the authors in detecting cognitive deficits in MS are needed.

In the discussion it must be underlined that really the % of impaired patients in the shortened BRB is higher compared to the extensive evaluation. This suggests that BRB, associated with a test investigating the executive functions, represents mostly the gold standard of a complete neuropsychological evaluation of MS patients.

Finally the references not validated need to be checked.
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