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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The first impression of the manuscript was good, it is a topic of high interest in the field of geriatrics and multidisciplinary approaches for tackling older adults' problems are needed. Authors gathered a number of societies from different disciplines into looking delirium and how care of individuals with this condition could be improved. This is certainly one of the strengths of the text. Since it was supposed to be a consensus, a methodology on how this consensus was reached was expected, such as how the literature was reviewed, how the members of the consensus were chosen, if the got together or if everything was done by distance, etc. There is an absolute absence on how this consensus was established. Furthermore,
there is not a clear objective on what the consensus was about. These two problems (lack of methodology and unclear objective), are flaws of the work that should be addressed.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

It is not stated as an objective, but it can be inferred that the objective was: "In this paper we advocate the interdisciplinary approach in the prevention..." However, there is no clear statement on what the consensus was for. Was it only a document, more of a "manifesto" of the societies involved? Agreeing on the fact that a multidisciplinary approach is needed in order to properly care for individuals with delirium, is not a consensus on that matter; and is far from a consensus if the recommendation on the actions needed to be taken in a certain region/continent in order to improve such care. So my suggestion is to actually include a clear objective of the manuscript, because this could be only a part of a bigger consensus that the reader doesn't understand and more information about it is needed. In the same vein, their is no clear methodology on how the consensus was performed, or if this is intended to be a narrative review? Or then again, a "manifesto" a position of the societies? A "task force" document? Report from a meeting? In its current form and without a clear methodology, this manuscript is not a consensus. Moreover, for any of the previously described types of manuscript, a strategy of literature research is needed. The introduction in particular lacks an up-to-date literature review, and therefore, it is composed of a number of facts about delirium that seem not to be part a logical sequence of a document. Or the authors are transcribing expert opinions? Again, unclear, and in need of clarification. Therefore the interpretation of what is written is on the one hand a summary of what is already known in a disordered arrangement (e.g., having the description of the barriers near the end of the manuscript and not at the beginning).

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The writing in addition to style correction, it should be checked for mistakes such as the one found in reference 49. A definition and distinction between interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary is advised instead of using both words interchangeably. The paper is referred in the title as "international" however, it has a clear regional focus in Europe. Also in the title, what is a "consensus collaboration"? Introduction should have a clear sequence, including what have other actual consensus stated about multidisciplinary approaches. It is not clear if authors have rights to use the figures presented in the manuscript. I would delete the original figures, because are not that informative.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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