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Reviewer's report:

Arita and Hosihn tried to compare the research trends for home care services between Japan and Korea. In particular, they compared by literature review of the established journals of the 2 countries. They found that there were considerable differences between them in research design in that the prevalence of quantitative research was higher in Korea though that of quantitative research was of the same level. The authors conclude in Abstract that more diverse research design should be adopted through future collaboration between the 2 countries to alleviate future home care services in both countries undergoing extremely rapid ageing of the society.

Their methods are appropriate and the analysis was meticulously performed but there some points to be addressed in Conclusion of Abstract (#1 and #2: minor but essential revision) and corrections (#3) are needed as listed below.

#1. In Conclusion of the abstract the authors state, “it is suggested that future collaboration be undertaken to further improve the diversity of research design and method especially”, but in Conclusion of the text there is no word of ‘collaboration’. This sentence should be rephrased as written in Conclusion of the text, which was directly derived from the obtained results. Furthermore, the phrase, ‘to further improve the diversity of research design and method’ is not clear because in the next sentence they state that “more diverse or advanced research design should be conducted”. The authors appear to deem ‘the diversity of research’ inappropriate because it should be improved, then the use of ‘more diverse research design’ is contradictory to it. The readers will be puzzled and a more precise phrasing is necessary.

#2. It is suggested that as a method of comparison they might use the Impact Factor as an indicator of the quality of articles. At least it should be mentioned whether it was considered or not.

#3. There are minor problems as listed below.

1. In Abstract, Background ‘compare of the similarities and differences on the research trends’ should be simply rephrased as ‘compare the research trends’. In the following sentence, ‘it was compared as for the research design....’. You need ‘for’ here.

2. In Abstract, Results, ... ‘shown only in Korean papers.’ You need ‘in’ here.

3. In Methods, 6 lines above Results, meaning of the sentence “However, MeSH
terms in both countries do not use exactly could see that.” is not clear and should be corrected.

4. In Conclusion, line 3 to 4. ‘of home care services’ at the end of the sentence should be deleted because it is repeated.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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