

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_121750</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring subjective cognitive decline and Caregiving Dynamics: A Study using Insights from BRFSS database</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>The paper is important:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it addresses to subjective cognitive decline and caregiving dynamics within public health and policy frameworks</li> <li>- it offers suggestions to improve access to healthcare services, particularly for underserved populations, as essential for ensuring that individuals experiencing cognitive symptoms receive timely and appropriate care.</li> <li>- the author argues that the observed trends in SCD and caregiving reflect a pressing public health concern that necessitates targeted interventions and resources</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>I would suggest as following:</b></p> <p><i>Investigating Caregiving Dynamics and Subjective Cognitive Decline: An Analysis Using BRFSS Database Insights</i></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>My recommendation for presentation of the abstract:</b></p> <p>The article addresses the rising concern of Subjective Cognitive Decline (SCD) among older adults in the United States, utilizing data from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS). It investigates the prevalence of SCD, professional consultation patterns, and caregiving dynamics. The study posits that the increasing prevalence of SCD, coupled with declining rates of professional consultation and mixed trends in caregiving, underscores the urgent need for enhanced public health strategies to support both individuals experiencing SCD and their caregivers.</p> <p><b>Objectives:</b> The primary issue discussed is the prevalence of SCD among older adults and the implications of these trends for healthcare access and caregiving support.</p> <p><b>Purpose:</b> The paper aims to explore the trends in SCD prevalence, professional consultations, and caregiving activities, while identifying demographic variations and changes over time.</p> <p><b>Intended Audience:</b> The intended audience includes public health professionals, researchers, policymakers, and caregivers who are interested in cognitive health and aging.</p> <p><b>Summary of Methods, Sample, and Main Findings:</b> The study employs a cross-sectional analysis of BRFSS data from 2020 and 2022, focusing on self-reported cognitive symptoms, consultation rates, and caregiving activities among adults aged 45 and older. The main findings indicate an increase in SCD prevalence from 9.7% to 11.7%, a decline in professional consultation rates, and mixed trends in caregiving activities.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> In conclusion, the article effectively highlights the rising trend of SCD among older adults and the corresponding shifts in professional consultation and caregiving dynamics. The findings underscore the urgent need for targeted public health strategies to address cognitive decline and improve support for caregivers. While the analysis is robust, incorporating qualitative data and deeper exploration of the observed trends would further strengthen the study's impact.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure, tone, and organization of ideas are appropriate, presenting the information in a logical and coherent manner that is accessible to the intended audience.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The author appears objective, focusing on data-driven findings and avoiding emotional or biased language</p> <p>The author's goal is largely achieved through the presentation of relevant data and implications for public health strategy, although more detailed recommendations could enhance the impact of the findings.</p> <p>The evidence is properly employed, as it utilizes robust data from a reputable surveillance system, providing a strong basis for the conclusions drawn.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>The evidence is adequate and convincing, presenting clear statistics that illustrate the trends in SCD and caregiving, although further qualitative data could enhance understanding</p> <p>The cross-sectional methodology is appropriate for examining trends over time, though longitudinal studies could provide more insight into changes in individual experiences.</p> <p>While the article provides a solid overview, it could benefit from more in-depth analysis of the factors contributing to the decline in professional consultation rates and the qualitative experiences of caregivers.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>-</p>	<p>It is recommended to add some more recent authors or papers (at least 10)</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><b>Recommendation for Improvement</b></p> <p>The article appears to be credible, assuming the authors have relevant backgrounds in public health or gerontology. The use of a recognized data source, BRFSS, adds to its legitimacy</p> <p>To improve the article, the author could include more qualitative insights from individuals experiencing SCD and caregivers, as well as explore the underlying reasons for the observed trends in professional consultation and caregiving dynamics</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Suela Ndoja</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Italian Albanian Association "Progetto Speranza", Albania</b>