

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_INDJ_122506 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Public Health Policies and Programs for Alzheimer's and Dementia: A Data-Driven Evaluation of Effectiveness and Areas for Improvement in the United States |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory 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 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. | This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it addresses critical issues in Alzheimer's disease management, including the impact of early detection programs and disparities in care access. By integrating comprehensive data sources and employing rigorous statistical analyses, the study offers valuable insights into how early diagnosis can influence patient outcomes and highlights disparities that need attention | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | It is ok | |
| 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. | The abstract is comprehensive but could be enhanced by summarizing the key findings and implications while potentially streamlining the technical details | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Discussion section could further improve the clarity and impact of the manuscript. | |
| 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. | This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous use of statistical methods and comprehensive data analysis. The detailed description of methodologies and transparent reporting of results underscore the manuscript's commitment to scientific accuracy and methodological rigor. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The manuscript's references are both sufficient and up-to-date | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Ensure that clarity, formal tone, and grammatical correctness are consistently maintained throughout the document. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

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

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Name: | S. Uma Maheswara Rao |
| Department, University & Country | SVECW, India |