

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_105124
Title of the Manuscript:	4 AT delirium assessment tool in hospitalized non-ICU patients (≥65 years): A systematic review on validity and reliability
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. manuscript important for scientific community 2. I suggest to rewrite the title as: The validity and reliability of 4 AT delirium assessment tool in hospitalized non-ICU patients (≥65 years): A systematic review article 3. Abstract section must be written clearly including the significance of the paper for scientific community; Each section is written in separate line as background, methods, results, conclusion, etc briefly 4. Regarding the subsection and appropriateness of the manuscript, the author's should carefully address the following points to improve the scientific soundness of the paper; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. What does this study adds to the scientific literatures? ii. I suggest to rewrite the methods subtitle as ' Methodology'. iii. What are the MeSH terms the author's were used? iv. Regarding inclusion criteria: you have wrote as Studies published from 2016 to 2022; What about the most recent articles published in 2023? v. Exclusion criteria: 1) Studies reporting the validity and reliability of the 4AT tool in non-hospitalized or ICU patients. 2) Studies not published in English. I don't think these are the proper exclusion criteria as you have excluded from the review; rather consider any criteria which may related to the PICO, Appropriateness of reviewed studies ,quality of generated evidence etc ; And it good if you rewrite in paragraph by separating with comma rather than numbering or bulletin. vi. What method (s) was used to assess the Methodological quality Randomized Control Trail (RCTs) studies included? vii. Studies were reported from 10 different countries from Asia, Europe, Australia, and Canada (Figure 2); What about other countries or continents unless you certain criteria is set to exclude? Because, this is a scientific paper distributed to all community (may affect your finding) 5. Table 4. Quality assessment of included studies; better if you write the study design clearly as whether it is RCT, cohort, case-control or crossectional for better understanding. 6. The author's tried to include the up to date references, but almost all included references are observational studies, which may reduce the quality of evidence generated by the paper. Try to include recently published RCTs 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Require some typos and language error revision like 'You may find the questions in Appendix 1 is not grammatically acceptable.'</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	The author's should carefully modify the manuscript to increase the quality of the paper.	
----------------------------------	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tajera Tageza Ilala
Department, University & Country	Hawassa University, Ethiopia