

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Neuropsychiatric Disease Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_INDJ_99965
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLANATORY MODELS OF DEMENTIA AMONG CAREGIVERS OF ELDERLY PERSONS WITH DEMENTIA – ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY DATA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalindj.com/index.php/INDJ/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. The prevalence of dementia among the elderly is increasing. Due to the course of the disease and the progressing irreversible deterioration of the health of the sick person, it requires carers to have thorough knowledge about the causes, course, progress and possibilities of medical care for the sick person. One cannot forget about the great sacrifice, which even more justifies equipping the caregiver with thorough knowledge. The study presented in the manuscript raises a very important aspect - the knowledge of carers of people with dementia.</p> <p>No, as it stands, it suggests the presence of dementia in caregivers of elderly people with dementia. Below is my proposal for an alternative title for the manuscript: "Explanatory models for dementia in the elderly based on the analysis of secondary data from caregivers".</p> <p>Needs minor improvement: 1) "So they are not concerned about help seeking" – in this sentence it is necessary to specify who are "they"?; 2) the abstract needs to be supplemented with a short conclusion from the study; 3) "keywords" – I would suggest deleting the word "Etiology" and add what this model is supposed to explain to the term "Explanatory model".</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p> <p>Yes, although a serious limitation is the small size of the study group, as indicated by the authors. Certainly the topic needs to be continued.</p> <p>It is difficult to say, because in the References section, the authors did not include most of the references that they cited in the text of the manuscript. In addition, both the References section and references in the text contain relatively "old" items, almost none of them are the most recent, i.e. from the last 5 years. In general, everything related to references requires a thorough revision.</p> <p>The text of the manuscript contains repetitions in many places that should be removed, e.g. the sentences "This is analysis of secondary data. Data was already available" (this information is repeatedly and unnecessarily repeated both in the section on the research methodology and in the discussion section). In addition, the numerical data contained in tables 1 and 2 are repeated in the description of the results. This is unnecessary abuse and causes unnecessary clutter in the research results presented. I would suggest deleting the arrow diagram in subsection 2.1 Procedure on page 2. This diagram does not make it any easier to understand how the data has been processed, moreover, it is not signed and is not referenced in the text of the manuscript. The size of tables 1 and 2 is too large – both tables take up unnecessarily much space, especially in terms of their content. The following information is missing in the section on the research methodology: 1) place and date of the research; 2) who conducted the interviews? Were these people properly trained?; 3) Were the study participants informed about how the study would be conducted? Was their consent to participate in the study required? Figure 1 is too large and needs formatting improvements. The "Conclusion" section is way too long. Much of the text in this section needs to be moved to other sections, such as "Introduction" and/or "Discussion". Please include a very short two-three-sentence conclusion from your own research. The last paragraph of this section is very valuable, but it also needs to be shortened.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>but I think a spelling test is required.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Malgorzata Stachon
Department, University & Country	Institute of Human Nutrition Sciences, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland