

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_120700
Title of the Manuscript:	Music Therapy 101 for Alzheimer's Disease: A Review of Current Trends and Future Directions
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>With this status I think the manuscript needed to revise those and take further consideration after those applied. I think a major revision status is appropriate for that status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grammar and Style: Revise for minor grammatical errors and improve readability. 2. Clarity and Conciseness: Some sections could be more concise to maintain reader engagement. 3. Update the systematic reviews is essential as musical therapy is mostly using in latest reviews. 4. May compare with the other symptomatology reviews like Witte et al (2023). <p>Sincerely.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript is concise and informative, effectively capturing the essence of the review by highlighting music therapy and its relevance to Alzheimer's disease.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is too short for evaluation and can not take attention to the reading the manuscript. May be widen it with sophisticated data would be good.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The introduction provides a comprehensive overview of Alzheimer's disease (AD), detailing its pathology, clinical manifestations, and the current state of treatment. It sets a solid foundation for discussing the potential role of music therapy as a non-pharmacological intervention. The rationale for exploring music therapy is well-articulated, emphasizing its relevance and potential benefits in AD management.</p> <p>The manuscript thoroughly reviews existing literature on music therapy and its impact on Alzheimer's disease, covering cognitive, emotional, and social benefits. Each section is well-organized, providing detailed explanations and supporting evidence from various studies.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The review highlights the positive effects of music therapy on memory, attention, and executive function. It effectively uses empirical evidence to support claims and discusses potential neurobiological mechanisms.</p> <p>The manuscript explores how music therapy can alleviate symptoms of depression, anxiety, and agitation. It draws on neuroscientific research to explain how music influences emotional regulation and mood enhancement.</p> <p>The social advantages of music therapy, such as improved social interactions and reduced isolation, are well-documented. The discussion on group music-making activities and their impact on social engagement is particularly insightful.</p> <p>The section on practical considerations and challenges provides a balanced view of the feasibility of implementing music therapy in clinical settings. It addresses key factors such as personalization, training, and integration into care plans, as well as challenges like resource allocation and standardization of protocols. This comprehensive approach helps readers understand both the potential and limitations of music therapy in AD treatment.</p> <p>The manuscript outlines several areas for future research, emphasizing the need for long-term studies, the development of standardized guidelines, and expanded access to music therapy. These recommendations are well-founded and align with the gaps identified in the current literature.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references section is comprehensive, including a wide range of studies and sources relevant to the topic. However, ensuring consistency in citation style and formatting would enhance the overall professionalism of the manuscript. However, there are several systematic meta-analysis and reviews which published in 2024 such as Williams et al, Willz G. et al, Liang F. et al (2023). This review may benefit from those articles and improve readability of the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript "Music Therapy 101 for Alzheimer's Disease: A Review of Current Trends and Future Directions" is a well-researched and informative review that effectively discusses the benefits, challenges, and future directions of music therapy in Alzheimer's disease treatment. Minor grammatical revisions and improvements in citation formatting would further enhance its quality. The review is a valuable contribution to the field, offering insights that could inform both clinical practice and future research. And also, minor updates of the references needed for the improvements.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language may be polished with some more effort after changes applied.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kerem Kemik</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey</p>