



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Psychiatry

ESPS Manuscript NO: 3577

Title: Improving Caregiving Competence, Stress Coping, and Mental Well-being in Family Carers of Individuals with Dementia: Piloting the Reitman Centre CARERS Program

Reviewer code: 02445273

Science editor: Zhai, Huan-Huan

Date sent for review: 2013-05-07 11:16

Date reviewed: 2013-05-13 05:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors described the pilot research of the Reitman Centre CARERS Program, which uses problem-solving techniques and simulation for hands on skills training in informal caregivers. They concluded that their results supported the effectiveness of the Program in improving caregiving competence, stress coping ability and mental well-being in carers caring for family members with dementia. The results are almost reasonable. However, there are a few issues on methodology and description of manuscript that should be taken into consideration. The authors should consider following points in order to understand their results fully. Major points 1) The result of "Participant Satisfaction Survey" should not be included in the report. That is just an impression of caregivers; if they received any services without any obligation, it is natural for them to give affirmative reactions. The results are only two items (agree/disagree), at least it should be scaling score with 5 items such as "Clinical Global Impression Scale". Authors must not write as "overall satisfaction rate was 95.8%" from this result without above mentioned attempt. 2) The authors need to add more description on care-givers' demographic data. Did they have past history of depression or other mental illness? How is their premorbid relationship between demented care recipients? As the main result of this study is their psychological scales such as "Geriatric Depression Scale", this information are important. Also, as the authors mentioned in the limitation section, there are no descriptions about care recipients. Except their evaluated either before or after the program, how about their basic information such as diagnosis, type of dementia, severity of dementia? 3) The first half of Discussion section (P12 and first paragraph of P13) is just general information and not directly associated with their results of this research. The authors should describe related to their results of



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road,
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

the study in the Discussion section. Minor points 1) There is no description on Informed Consent. 2) In the last paragraph of Introduction section, the authors need to summarize the aim of their research. Numbers of subjects are not necessary in this section. 3) In the Method section, Participants should be mentioned prior to Intervention. 4) In the Abstract section, it is not appropriate to describe such as “significant reduction in depression (-0.67 ± 2.63 , $p < 0.05$)”. As most of readers read from Abstract section, they cannot understand what scale was used and what is the meaning of “ -0.67 ± 2.63 ”. Instead, the authors should describe as “significant reduction in Geriatric Depression Scale(...)”.