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Reviewer’s report:

The authors made a systematic review to determine whether an association between OSA and MCI exists.

They concluded that the prevalence of OSA in patients with MCI is influenced by diagnostic methods and patient recruitment locations (community or clinic based population), which limits the interpretation of the data, and that the true OSA prevalence in elderly individuals with MCI may be close to that of the general population with a similar age group, approximately 27%.

The methods are well explained. The authors explained the inclusion and exclusion criteria adequately. However, the main limitation of the review is the small number of articles included in the final analysis (only 5). With so few adequate studies on the theme, would it be possible to make a systematic review on the subject?

Results: The review included only cross-section studies, then a temporal relationship between the OSA and MCI could not be defined. Although the authors mentioned this in the results, this should be said in the limitation paragraph.

In the discussion section, the authors should add some possible pathophysiological explanations about the correlation between OSA and MCI.
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