Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 2 · Issue 2 · e149109

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Motivations and Impact of Training of Home Care Workers for Older Adults in Nigeria

Oluwagbemiga Oyinlola, Lawrence Adekunle Adebusoye, Olufemi O Olowookere, Eniola Olubukola Cadmus, Abimbola Afolabi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
2 Jun 2024	11 Aug 2024	15 Aug 2024	10.5812/chbs-149109

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

4 comments · 13 Jun 2024 – 26 Jun 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 13 Jun 2024

Dear author, please:
Adjust the article according to the journal's format.
The title does not match the purpose of the study. Please review and edit.
Review the abstract section and rewrite it in 250 words.
Revise the introduction for coherence and integrity.
Clearly explain the characteristics of the studied community and the participant selection process.
Clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study.
Add sections for ethical considerations, limitations, acknowledgment, funding, and conflict of interest.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Jun 2024

General Questions for Review
• Subject
• 1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? yes
• 2) Does the article have novelty? yes
• Title
• 3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? yes
• 4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No
• Abstract
• 5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes
• 6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? NO
• Introduction
• 7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) YES
• 8) Does the Introduction include “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? YES
• Materials and Methods
• 9) Is the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) clearly described? YES
• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? YES
• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? YES
• 12) Subjects Representative of the Target Population? YES
• 13) Is a sample size calculation or justification provided? YES
• 14) Control Subjects Appropriate? OK
• 15) Power of the study declared? OK
• 16) Are actual P values reported for primary analyses? Not necessary for this article
• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)? Not necessary for this article
• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)? Not necessary for this article
• 19) Are the methods and apparatus identified (with the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses)? Not necessary for this article
• 20) Are procedures identified in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results? OK
• 21) Are all drugs and chemicals used precisely identified, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration? Not necessary for this article
• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? YES

• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Not necessary for this article
• Results
• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? OK
• 25) Are results presented in a logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? OK
• 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? OK
• 27) Are technical terms used as nontechnical terms in statistics, such as “random” (which implies a randomizing device), “normal,” “significant,” “correlations,” and “sample”? Not necessary for this article
• Discussion
• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? OK
• 29) Does the analysis support the Conclusion? OK
• References
• 30) Proper Writing of the References? OK
• 31) References from the last five years? OK

Associate Editor MINOR REVISION 26 Jun 2024

This article needs minor revision.

Editor-in-Chief MINOR REVISION 26 Jun 2024

This article needs minor revision.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author, please:

Adjust the article according to the magazine format.

The title does not match the purpose of the study. Please review and edit.

Response: This has been addressed by aligning the topic with the research objective.

Review the abstract section and rewrite it in 250 words.

Response: Thank you, the word count is now 212 words.

Revise the introduction for coherence and integrity.

Response: Thank you for the comment, we have addressed this ensure that it captures the what and why the study in Nigeria.

Clearly explain the Characteristics of the studied community and participant selection process.

Response: We address comment in the method section of the manuscript by offering deeper content of the training, the course outline, how the participants were selected for participation in the study, including the demographic characteristics of participants.

Clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the study.

Response: We appreciate your comment, we clearly stated the inclusion and exclusion criteria in page 5 of the main manuscript. The program was aimed at individuals holding at least a Bachelor's degree from recognized Nigerian universities who are keen on delivering care to the elderly at home.

Add sections for ethical considerations, limitations, acknowledgment, funding, and conflict of interest.

Response: We appreciate your comment. This has been addressed on page 13 of the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

General Questions for Review

- *Subject*
- *1) Is the article within the scope of the journal? yes*
- *2) Does the article have novelty? yes*
- *Title*
- *3) Does the title reflect the content appropriately? yes*
- *4) Is there any abbreviation in the title? No*
- *Abstract*
- *5) Is there a structured Abstract? Yes*
- *6) Are Keywords (3-10) selected from MESH? NO*
- *Introduction*
- *7) Clarity of the objectives/hypotheses? (Are the objectives clearly stated?) YES*
- *8) Does Introduction include: “What we know,” “What we don’t know” and “Aims”? YES*
- *Materials and Methods*
- *9) Clearly describe the selection of participants (patients or laboratory animals, including controls)?YES*

• 10) Study Design Described Sufficiently? YES
• 11) Adequacy of the sample studied? YES
• 12) Subjects Representative of Target Population? YES
• 13) Provided sample size calculation or justification? YES
• 14) Control Subjects Appropriate? OK
• 15) Power of study declared? OK
• 16) Reported actual P values for primary analyses? Not necessary for this article
• 17) Blinding of Investigators (if applicable)? Not necessary for this article
• 18) Blinding of subjects (if applicable)? Not necessary for this article
• 19) Identify the methods apparatus (give the manufacturer's name and address in parentheses)? Not necessary for this article
• 20) Identify procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results? OK
• 21) Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration? Not necessary for this article
• 22) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Explained? YES
• 23) Appropriate Statistical Analysis? Not necessary for this article
• Results
• 24) Appropriateness, clarity, and adequacy of the Tables and Figures? OK
• 25) Present results in logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations, giving the main or most important findings? OK
• 26) Duplicate data in graphs and tables? OK
• 27) Use technical terms as non-technical in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample."? Not necessary for this article
• Discussion
• 28) Conclusion justified & substantiated? OK
• 29) Analysis supports Conclusion? OK
• References
• 30) Proper Writing of the References? OK
• 31) References for the last five years? OK

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 15 Aug 2024 – 15 Aug 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Aug 2024

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Aug 2024

accept