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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have made a reasonable and interesting review of a variety of different MMSE versions used in Asia countries with various natural and cultural backgrounds. The authors illustrated and compared the differences in multiple MMSE domains of the MMSE versions, which is very helpful for understanding the impact of cultural differences on MMSE results, especially when comprehending cross-cultural studies.

My two major concerns are:

1. As we know and mentioned in the introduction part, different MMSE versions have adopted different cut-off points in differentiating patients with cognitive impairments or dementia, I would suggest the authors to provide the cut-offs of the reviewed MMSE versions.

2. It was mentioned that the 3 words used in registration and recall test were selected freely by the raters. So it might happened that words of different familiarities and frequencies were selected in different administrations. How would this impact the validity of MMSE? Is there any literature addressing this question?

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.

Unable to assess

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
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