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Reviewer's report:

This is a protocol for a systematic review to compare the accuracy of two short exams that are used in general practice to identify dementia. The idea for this study arose from a review by the same authors on systematic reviews in which they found a lack of clear evidence on the diagnostic accuracy of such rapid assessment tools. By conducting a comparative accuracy review of the two most frequently studied exams, they hope to be able to provide insight into which one has higher accuracy.

I only have a few minor comments as the authors were very thorough in their protocol:

* Is the review of systematic reviews published? If so, it's not clear in the text which reference this is.

* The conclusion of this previous review could be formulated a bit more specifically in the introduction.

* Many items are already pre-determined for this review, but not how Quadas-2 will be tailored. It's not necessary for the protocol, especially as this is a comparative review, but it would be helpful to show that you thought about how quality would be assessed before beginning the review.

* There are 3 most frequently studied tests, but you only include 2. It's not clear why the 3rd is not included or what it was, but maybe I am missing something.

* It is not clear how many systematic reviews you have identified. You say 13, but I only see references for 7 in the introduction (pg. 3 line 34).

* You could add a reference for a methods paper on comparative accuracy reviews.

* There were a few typos:
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