

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Home-Isolation Care in Newly COVID19-positive Elderly Patients: A Caregiver-Centric Explanatory Framework Author Information

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Ali Delshad Noghabi

Submitted on: 25 May 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2023.1606060

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main findings of the study.

Due to the vulnerability of the elderly during the Kovid-19 pandemic and the high pressure on health caregivers, home care can be a way to prevent hospital infections and reduce patient stress.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

However, an excellent theoretical framework but the most important limitation of negative attitudes to the elderly (ageism) and the disabled, is the inability of other family members to take care of the elderly, and the lack of advanced facilities for the elderly.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.

It will be more appropriate if the practical strategies and barriers in the home of the elderly are expressed in the discussion.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

The title is appropriate, but " The Choice of " can be removed from the title.

Q 5 Are the keywords appropriate?

Behavior is not suitable. Home Isolation can be added.

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

good

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

References are relatively good.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9 Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 12 Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 13 Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Q 14 Overall scientific quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.
