



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_42516
Title of the Manuscript:	Resilience of the Caregivers Attending to Alzheimer's Patients
Type of the Article	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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: - Social support should be added to the title because it is one of the primary research questions. Introduction: - Dementia is defined more appropriately in academic references. Why did the author(s) use this non-academic social website as a reference? - There is no reference cited as the source of information on the prevalence of each type of dementia. It needs to be cited properly. - The introduction on dementia is rather long. The author(s) should focus in this section on the purpose of the study which is caregiver resilience and social support. - Line 40 page 1 should be the beginning of the introduction. - The part of the introduction from line 55 page 2 should be transferred to the discussion section especially since the discussion section is very poor and should be enriched with more research to compare to. - The aim should be written in a simple direct form. No need to use words like "surprisingly", and no need to put the title of the article in bold font in between quotations. - The theoretical framework could be put within the introduction instead of the comparative studies that should be transferred to the discussion. Materials and methods: - In this section the authors should explain study design, setting, sampling, and inclusion and exclusion criteria. Have the author(s) obtained consent and ethical committee approval? It is not clear. - In line 145, the authors stated: "very strongly agree (1)". It should be corrected to "very strongly disagree (1)". Results and discussion: - What are the cut-offs used to categorize resilience as low, moderate or high? Also, what are the cut-offs for categorization of social support? It is mandatory to be put in the methodology section. - The regression analysis table should include every variable put in the analysis individually. - The number of caregivers with low resilience and low social support is small and this could be the reason why insignificant results with regression analysis were seen. A sample size calculation of the minimum number of positive cases should be done to avoid this. References: - References that are published online are written with only a URL with no name or author or date of last access. Please rewrite following standard format.	It was a great pleasure to hear comments from you Sir/Madam. As per your suggestion I changed title of my manuscript. Coming to the introduction, Materials and methods I made all the changes which you have suggested. In results I added categorization cut offs of scales. I added all the regression tables. Actually I thought it would be lengthy if I add all the tables of regression. So I didn't add previously. However now I added all these things. I made corrections in the bibliography. Thank you very for your valuable suggestions. I will be in a debt to you.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The resilience questionnaire is better put in a separate paragraph.	