ABSTRACT:

1. Title: Association between Migration and cognitive Status among Middle-aged and Older adults: A systematic review.

Needs revision to be more succinct without the use of word synthesis (e.g., Thesis, antithesis and synthesis are the words which the reader knows during the ongoing process of an article). It could be "To find an association of migration and cognitive function among migrant and non-migrant population."

2. Method:

The author may incorporate the word systemic review and meta-analysis.

3. Findings:

Show discrepancies regarding distribution of 25 studies, which were extracted from different sources and distributed among the countries.

4. Conclusion:

Has a discrepancy between abstract and main manuscript's conclusion.

5. Keywords:

Should have been:

"Cognition, Memory disorder, Dementia, Emigration, Immigration."
Introduction:

It needs major revision.

It starts with the definition of migration and then fails to clearly delineate the global burden.

Text quoted at [4] fails to define its relevance because of its wordiness.

Then rationale of an article was defined followed by associated risk factors of migration and impact on personal life and environment.

The article fails to follow logical progression of thought in defining the aim and purpose of the study e.g., association of migration and cognition among immigrants or emigrants etc.

It ends suddenly with an aim of study and impact of migration on aging population.

Method:

It's a systemic review and meta-analysis.

The article fails to describe the [Mesh term] search used for meta-analysis.

Flow diagram shows discrepancy regarding extraction of 25 articles that were included for the final analysis of the study that comprising of 22 and 3 more articles added later from the reference lists. However, these 25 articles were arrived at one step earlier in the flow diagram (163-138=25).

The results failed to apply:

1. The Level of evidence from the oxford centre for EBM e.g., Ia or Ib, etc.
2. Grading of recommendation: A, B, C,D
3. Quality of evidence: Good, fair or poor.
4. Strength of recommendation: A,B,C,D

The statistical means in arriving at the conclusion fixed-effect or a random-effect model should have been used (e.g., non application of forest plot, Z-score, dependent or independent variable and/or meta-regression etc.)
Assessment of reporting biases should have been described.

Discussion:
Though critically applied but failed to detect various forms of bias and hadn't applied the validity item scores for each article.
The effect of bias on the results of the study should have been analyzed.

Conclusion:
It should have been drawn to the initial question i.e., patient population, intervention, control/comparison and outcome. The aforementioned objections raise significant doubt regarding the conclusion and can't be relied upon.

Discretionary revisions:
The text needs correction of minor grammatical errors in introduction page 3, line 8th; page 11, line 5th & line13; page14 line 18 and in authors contribution to improve the manuscript.

Recommendation:
The article after due revision/corrections may be accepted for publication.
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