

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

Francesca Borgnis¹

¹ Fondazione Don Carlo Gnocchi

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper describes the adaptation of Motivationally Enhanced Compensatory Cognitive Training for Mild Cognitive Impairment (ME-CCT-MCI) in an Indian population. This study has great potential in clinical practice. However, major revisions are needed before considering it for publication.

Title

1. It is necessary to specify that this is a pilot study

Abstract

1. IAME-CCT-MCI: Please, define the abbreviation
2. Methods: the scales and questionnaires used by the authors are missing.
3. Results: the authors report scores without saying what they correspond to. What does "3.87" mean?

Introduction

1. Please, it is necessary that each statement is supported by references to increase the scientific validity of the work.
2. The references give cite old studies. is it possible that no further works have come out on rehabilitation?
3. The authors cited CogSMART and CCT without providing information on benefits. Why would treatments used for other pathologies be good for MCI?
4. The rationale of the described activities is not well supported.

Methods

1. Were participants diagnosed with MCI? In the abstract, the authors talk about elderly people with MCI, but it is not written in the methods.
2. Which criteria were used in the study for the diagnosis of MCI?

3. What were the reasons for the non-participation of the 3 experts to assess the content of the intervention?
4. The intervention was not described by the authors.
5. How were the patients recruited?
6. How was the sample size determined?
7. Authors speak about the randomized pilot. What type of randomization was used in the study?
8. Assessment: What was the period of time between assessments?
9. Analysis. Missing data: analysis for second phase, normality test.

Results

1. Missing data: The p values in some parts of the results section, when a statistically significant difference in the analysis was mentioned.
2. Authors used Paired t-test analysis. This choice assumes that the variables are normally distributed. Is it correct?

Discussion

1. The discussion contains a lot of information, and sometimes it is difficult for a reader to follow the logical thread of the speech.
2. References should be added in order to comment on the results obtained in light of the literature to increase the scientific validity of the work.
3. Missing data: limitation section, for example sample size calculation.

General points:

1. an English language review is required