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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting work on plasma LIPG levels in early dementia and MCI. While the sample size is small and limited to a single centre, never the less, it does highlight some interesting aspects in the early stages of the disease process which can be useful in future research. It is well written over all. Following areas could be reviewed by the authors:

Abstract:

It has spelling errors in a few places. The conclusion could be worded differently to reflect on association rather than causation.

Methods:

This section needs clarification and more detailed elaboration. How were the participants approached and recruited? How were NC approached and recruited. Was it using advertisements?

What was the age cut off for recruitment? How did you decide the sample size. Is this a secondary analysis of another study?

Who did the baseline clinical assessment ad diagnosis?

What was included in blood chemistry? It can vary with labs and countries?

Results:

I am unable to assess the PET scan analysis. Overall nicely done.

Is the medication data available? It may help to describe how many were on statins or anti-inflamamtory agents?

Tables: all abbreviations need to be spelt out for all tables.

It would be helpful if the authors can comment about the useful ness of their findings for future studies or directions.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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