

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58745

Title: Behavioral Interventions for Oral Care in Cognitively Impaired Older Adults.

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality	✓			
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The topic is clinically relevant and timely.
- The review focuses on an important geriatric care problem.
- Multiple recognized databases were searched.
- The review includes several established behavioral approaches.
- Threat Perception Theory is clearly discussed.
- Caregiver involvement is appropriately emphasized.
- Recent literature is included along with established studies.
- The paper identifies important gaps for future research.

Weakness of the study:

- The search strategy is not described in sufficient detail.
- No study selection or screening process is reported.
- The number of included studies is not clearly stated.
- Formal quality assessment is not adequately presented.
- The narrative approach limits objective comparison of evidence.
- Some recommendations appear stronger than the available evidence.
- Grammar and spelling need careful editing.
- Reference consistency and terminology require improvement.

Reviewer's Comments:

This is a relevant and well focused narrative review addressing an important problem in oral care among cognitively impaired older adults. The paper covers several useful behavioral approaches, including adaptive communication, individualized support, environmental modification and caregiver supported care. The literature search includes major databases and clearly defined broad inclusion criteria. Ethical clearance is not applicable to this narrative review because no human participants or primary patient data were involved, although this could be stated clearly in the manuscript. The main concern is the limited description of the review methodology. Details regarding screening, study selection, number of included articles and formal assessment of study quality are not sufficiently reported. The authors themselves acknowledge considerable heterogeneity and limitations in the existing evidence. The writing is generally understandable, but grammar, spelling and consistency in terminology require editing. Overall, the paper is informative and clinically useful, but methodological clarification and careful language revision are needed.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript presents itself as a narrative review and cites relevant published literature. No statement confirming previous publication or duplicate submission is provided. The reference list is substantial and includes recent as well as established sources. A formal similarity or plagiarism check should be completed by the journal before final acceptance.