

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nursing and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRNH_75613
Title of the Manuscript:	A Multi-Component Cognitive Stimulation Program among Older People with Dementia in Day Care Centers of Taiwan: A Pilot Study
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The author(s) present findings following an intervention of a multi-component stimulation program among older people living with dementia, residing in day care centres. The author(s) further describe the components of the intervention</p> <p>Below are recommended mandatory revisions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Re-write the introduction section to highlight the problem with a special focus on this population and setting, as a justification for implementing the intervention and therefore conducting the study 2. Move portions (highlighted in the manuscript) of the current introduction section to the discussion section as they are more suitable to be considered in the discussion of findings than where they are currently positioned. These portions should be further summarized as highlighted in the manuscript 3. Provide more information on data analysis, specifically how continuous, non-continuous, and behavioral patterns were analyzed 4. State number of participants in the results section, not in the materials and methods section 5. The author(s) provides detailed description of other studies' findings. This unnecessary detail is masking the findings from this study. It is recommended that other studies' findings be summarized and ample emphasis placed on findings from this study, citing other studies for purposes of discussing findings from this study 6. There are several grammatical errors that compromise the reader's understanding of the limitations. The section should be re-written to improve grammar, coherence and ease understanding by the reader 7. Re-write the conclusion to accurately represent findings and deductions from this study 8. Additional comments are inserted in the manuscript, using track-changes function 	
Minor REVISION comments	Review the entire manuscript to improve grammar and coherence	
Optional/General comments	Review the entire manuscript, including references, to ensure adherence to journal guidelines/ instructions to authors	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victoria Katawera
Department, University & Country	Sierra Leone