



Paper: “Examining the Risk of Delirium Among Residents with Diabetes in Long-Term Care Homes Across Ontario”

Submitted: 11 November 2024

Accepted: 11 February 2025

Published: 28 February 2025

Corresponding Author: Robyn Gorham

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n6p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Julian Kraja
University of Shkodra “Luigj Gurakuqi” Albania

Reviewer 2: Yaser Adnan Abo Jeesh
Faculty of Medicine, University of Gezira – Sudan

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title is clear and adequately represents the content. However, it could benefit from rephrasing to emphasize the analysis and findings.

I suggest to be: Examining the Risk of Delirium Among Residents with Diabetes in Long-Term Care Homes Across Ontario.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract effectively outlines the study's aim, scope, methods, findings, and conclusions. However, the language could be more concise, and the association between diabetes and delirium could be explicitly quantified (e.g., odds ratios).

I Suggest the following:

Include more specific data from the results (e.g., the odds ratio and confidence interval).

Revise for brevity:

Aim: To examine risk factors for delirium in residents with diabetes in Ontario's LTC homes.

Methods: A population-based retrospective analysis of the RAI-MDS dataset (2019–2020) was conducted.

Findings: Diabetes was associated with a statistically significant increased risk of delirium (Odds Ratio: 1.073, CI 1.038–1.109), compounded by polypharmacy.

Conclusions: Comprehensive delirium mitigation strategies are needed for this vulnerable population.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The manuscript contains minor grammatical issues.

I suggest to perform a thorough grammar and clarity check to improve readability.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

The methods are well-detailed, including data source, population, variables, and statistical approach. The inclusion of ethical approval enhances credibility.

I Suggest to:

- * Clarify the rationale for excluding the variable “psychosis” in more detail.
- * Include more discussion on how potential biases (e.g., reporting bias) were mitigated.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The body is generally clear, but there are areas where the flow could be improved:

Strengths:

- * Comprehensive literature review supports the study's rationale.
- Results are presented with appropriate statistical backing.

Weaknesses:

- * Some sentences are overly long and could be simplified.
- * The discussion occasionally repeats points made earlier in the introduction.

I suggest to streamline the discussion to avoid redundancy, focusing on interpreting the data and implications.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

The conclusion aligns with the study's findings and emphasizes the importance of recognizing delirium in diabetic residents in LTC.

I suggest to:

- * Strengthen the conclusion by including a more direct call to action for integrating delirium risk into clinical guidelines for diabetes care.
- * Avoid overly speculative statements about future policy without supporting evidence.

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

- * References are relevant, recent, and comprehensive. Standardized formatting should be applied throughout the reference list.
- * References should be appropriately aligned with their corresponding paragraphs.
- * All references must adhere to the APA style guidelines.

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the BODY of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

Overall Recommendation!!!

Accepted, minor revision needed

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The manuscript provides a well-structured exploration of an important topic. With minor revisions for clarity, conciseness, and grammatical polish, it would be a strong contribution to the literature.
