



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 51749

Title: A comparison of novel tools with traditional cognitive tests in detecting delirium and comorbid delirium-dementia in elderly medical patients

Reviewer's code: 02989927

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Research Scientist, Doctor, Research Associate, Senior Scientist

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Author's country: Ireland

Manuscript submission date: 2019-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-09 09:10

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-09 10:05

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
--------------------	------------------	------------	--------------------------



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish		<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

51749 A comparison of novel tools with traditional cognitive tests in detecting delirium and comorbid delirium-dementia in elderly medical patients, by Meagher et al., 2019. This is a study to investigate the accuracy of bedside tests of attention, vigilance and visuospatial ability. For 180 consecutive elderly medical inpatients (around age 80; 51% female) referred to a psychiatry for later life consultation-liaison service, the final samples consisted of following: with delirium (n =44), dementia (n =30), comorbid delirium-dementia (n = 60) and cognitively intact controls (n = 46). Participants were assessed cross-sectionally with conventional bedside cognitive tests (WORLD, Months Backward, Spatial span, Vigilance A and B, CDT and Pentagons) and two novel cognitive tests (Lighthouse test, LSD-4). All testes showed high sensitivity (>70%). Authors suggested that these tests can distinguish neurocognitive disorders, including delirium, from other presentations. The Lighthouse Test and the LSD-4 are novel tests with high accuracy for detecting delirium. This is a useful study investigating the performance of different bedside neurocognitive tests. The sensitivity and specificity of each tests were presented. I would ask the authors to make clear which is the gold standard comparison for each test. This should be done across the text and the Tables. I would improve the section on statistics. The ROC curve analyses is essential for this



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

type of study. I recommend plotting the ROC curve of all tests in a single additional Figure. On the limitation: currently, it is listed several limitations. I think that not all of them could have biased your findings. Please edit this and only declare those core limitations. Otherwise, readers will see a paper with so many errors that will not believe on your findings. Minor English double check is advised.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 51749

Title: A comparison of novel tools with traditional cognitive tests in detecting delirium and comorbid delirium-dementia in elderly medical patients

Reviewer's code: 03764910

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's country: Japan

Author's country: Ireland

Manuscript submission date: 2019-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-10 00:16

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-19 09:47

Review time: 9 Days and 9 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this article, the author attempted to apply a couple of new cognitive tests for detection of delirium. The study design seems to have been well constructed. Besides some limitations the author also mentioned, the conclusion looks acceptable. I am concerned about the circumstance the cognitive test battery was performed, because most patients with delirium, as well as patients with Levy-body type dementia, alter their level of consciousness in a day. When did the participants take the test? Were the starting time same (e.g. ten o'clock, or early afternoon) among the participants? If so, the author should describe that. If not, are there any proof that each participants could perform their best effort to take the exam? Where was the place the test performed, an examination room or the bed room of the participant? Are there any effort performed to uniform the condition of the examination? These information will be helpful for other researchers to evaluate the result of this study later.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

[Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

Manuscript NO: 51749

Title: A comparison of novel tools with traditional cognitive tests in detecting delirium and comorbid delirium-dementia in elderly medical patients

Reviewer's code: 03887097

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MBBS, MSc

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's country: Singapore

Author's country: Ireland

Manuscript submission date: 2019-10-02

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-15 01:06

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-24 14:57

Review time: 9 Days and 13 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

- The title of the manuscript does not accurately reflect the main subject/hypothesis. Is the focus of the study to detect delirium or to identify comorbid delirium-dementia in elderly medical patients? - In the introduction, it is important to mention that we already have a common diagnostic language for delirium that takes into account and recognizes patient diversity. This diagnostic language is based upon the Confusion Assessment Method (CAM) algorithm, which is the most widely used delirium assessment and consists of four features: 1) acute alteration/fluctuation from baseline mental status, 2) inattention, 3) disorganized thinking, and 4) acute altered level of consciousness. - Were the tests all administered in English? The majority of studies on tools for identifying delirium were conducted across a broad range of inpatient settings internationally in elderly inpatients, including patients with dementia but most excluded nonnative language speakers. - Please provide the actual IRB study/approval number. - How was sample size determined? There is currently no evidence of power calculation. The present sample appears small and limited to a convenience sample. - Although there are an existing plethora of validated delirium screening tools, it is unclear which tool best suits particular populations, especially as this study utilized a rather undifferentiated population. This should be a proposed area for future work. - Suggest to replace Ref [14] with a published manuscript. - The underlying data should be made available to the readers (if this is not possible, please state why).

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

[] The same title

[] Duplicate publication



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

BPG Search:

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No