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Reviewer's report:

The use of the term virtual reality in this paper is not consistent with the definition given by the virtual reality society: "Virtual reality is the term used to describe a three-dimensional, computer generated environment which can be explored and interacted with by a person. That person becomes part of this virtual world or is immersed within this environment and whilst there, is able to manipulate objects or perform a series of actions." (https://www.vrs.org.uk/virtual-reality/what-is-virtual-reality.html, accessed 18 4 19). By including games consoles and auditorium motion sensors, the paper blurs the key distinction between immersive and other kinds of technologically enhanced experience. There is every reason to expect that three-dimensional, immersive experiences will have effects on people with dementia, and this is an area that needs high-quality, systematic reviews. However, by not differentiating immersive technology from more commonplace gaming technology, like the Nintendo Wii, the paper is a victim of 'garbage in, garbage out'. A better approach would be to do two reviews; one on immersive technology (Virtual Reality) and one on technologically-enhanced user experience (Augmented Reality).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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