

Review of: "Feasibility and Efficacy of a Newly Adapted Multimodal Cognitive Intervention for the Elderly with Mild Cognitive Impairment"

Anoop Sheshadri¹

¹ University of California, San Francisco

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The subject matter of the manuscript is of importance, given the prevalence of cognitive dysfunction in India and elsewhere and the necessity of finding optimal methods with which to treat it. I have a few comments.

1. The paper in general is easy to read but could use some additional revision for grammar – for example:

Abstract, Methods, second sentence might read better as: “For the first phase we recruited rehabilitation experts (N=7) for content evaluation. This was followed by recruitment of elderly participants with MO (N=12) to rate the intervention. In phase two, we enrolled elderly participants (perhaps more detail on setting here? Presumably with MCI, in India?) (N=32) for a randomized pilot study using a single-group pre- and post-test design.

Or later in introduction, the sentence “Also, not adapted to the Indian context” is a sentence fragment and should be completed; e.g., In addition, the ME-CCT-MCI has not been adapted for the Indian context.

Also in the introduction, the “Thus the present study..” sentence could perhaps be restructured to read: The present study aims to clarify what adaptations might be necessary to...”

1. The abstract should also have more details on the length of the intervention, timing of outcome assessment, etc. The results should have more details on the participants ultimately enrolled (severity of cognitive impairment, age) as well as completion rate of intervention.
2. In Methods and elsewhere keep to the same tense – for example you write rehabilitation experts were approached, but then seven have accepted (rather than simply accepted) and participants are doctorates (rather than were doctorates). Past tense is appropriately used elsewhere.
3. For exclusion criteria – brain atrophy on MRI? Was having an MRI or other imaging for brain atrophy part of the study? Was there any exclusion for stroke?
4. What was the setting from which the total population of 216 elderly were screened? Was this at a clinic visit, or from a hospital site, or from a neighborhood? Who was approaching these participants? More detail on recruitment is needed.
5. To clarify – is this study both adapting the ME-CCT-MCI for elderly patients with MCI and also for the Indian context? That is, is has not been used in the Indian context at all in other populations? If adapted for both, what was the order in

which adaptation occurred?

6. It would be useful to also reports the characteristics of the elderly participants in the adaptation phase.
7. Please add age to Table 3.
8. Please report full p-values in Table 5.