Reviewer’s report

Title: Cross-cultural perspective of family caregivers’ experiences in utilizing dementia services in Australia: a qualitative study

Version: 1 Date: 16 September 2013

Reviewer: Susan Benbow

Reviewer’s report:

Cross-cultural perspective of family caregivers’ experiences in utilizing dementia services in Australia: a qualitative study

Overall I found this an interesting and well written paper on an under-researched topic and which makes some important points.

Major compulsory revisions

None

Minor essential revisions

1. Title

This is not a cross cultural perspective on the carers’ experiences. It is an account of the experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse family caregivers in utilizing dementia services in Australia.

2. Aim

The aim of the study is described in the abstract as being to explore the experiences of caregivers in dementia service utilization (page 2) and this is also implied by the third sentence of the Results section, but under the heading Aims (page 8) it is described as to explore the experiences of caregivers in order to understand how they manage dementia services and whether they were satisfied with services. These are slightly different and it would be helpful to clarify the aim or aims.

3. Page 6 refers to Berry (2003) and it is not clear which reference this is in the numbered reference list.

4. Page 9 refers to a paper by Braun and Clarke – I don’t think this is in the numbered list.

Discretionary revisions

1. Methods

The method is well described, but I wasn’t clear whether coding was carried out manually or using a software package. Page 10 refers to the selection criteria without specifying what they were: does this refer to the two criteria set out on
page 8 under the heading participants, namely 1 year of experience in caring and
daily contact with a PWD? If that is the case it might be helpful on page 8 to
describe these as selection criteria.

2. Results

The four themes are clearly set out and illustrated with quotations from the
interviews/focus groups. I would like to see the authors put more emphasis on
what we can learn about negotiating services that is pertinent to these particular
CaLD carers. Negotiating services for the PWD is probably a big issue for all
family carers – what is it about being from a CaLD group that makes this a major
issue? Are differing expectations relevant here? (The quotation from Chinese
carer 11 suggests this is a factor.)

3. Similarly 3 of the 4 listed characteristics of satisfactory services on page 17
are probably common to many carers, unless the authors have identified ways in
which coming from a CaLD community impacts on them. The same might be said
of the carers’ negative experiences in utilising services. The quotation from
Chinese carer 8 suggests that cultural and linguistic factors might be operating
here too.

4. Discussion and conclusions

On page 25 the authors refer to the potential conflicts of interest between the
consumer and the service provider. This is a very important point and it would be
helpful to elaborate on it. Similarly the paragraph on page 26 about cultures that
value group achievements above individual ones and the implications this might
have in terms of educating and preparing families to care for someone with
dementia is also very important and could be elaborated further.

5. The conclusions state (page 27) that the carers’ “judgement”/evaluation of
dementia services was influenced by their experiences prior to migration. This
might be the case but have the authors found any evidence to support this in
their study or is this a hypothesis (and if so that should be made clear and it
would be more appropriately included in the discussion rather than the
conclusions).

6. I think the paragraph regarding the limitations of the study which is currently in
the conclusions on page 28 would fit better in the discussion.

Specific points that would benefit from clarification:

7. Page 6. Could the authors explain what is meant by “ethno-focussed” services.
This term may be used in Australia but is not necessarily known to people in
other countries.

8. page 7: the term “adequate beliefs” is used. I suspect the authors mean
adequate knowledge. I don’t think a belief is described as “adequate”.

9. page 8 states that the study was carried out “in a capital city of Australia”. I
thought Canberra was the capital of Australia but having looked this up on
Google I have learnt that there are 8 state and territory capital cities. To avoid confusing non-Australians perhaps this could be rephrased.

10. page 9 the top paragraph states that if carers were unable to attend focus groups “individual-based interviews were considered to be appropriate”. Was it the case that carers had a choice of whether to attend a focus group or to be seen individually (which is what I thought had been done) but that if people couldn’t attend the focus group they were allocated they were then offered an individual interview? It would be helpful to make this clear (if I have understood it correctly).

11. Page 10 talks about the process of coding – should the word “intergrade” be integrate?

12. Page 10 states that rigor was enhanced by reporting findings back to the participating organisations. I think that if reporting back is to enhance rigor the organisations concerned would need to have chance to respond to the report and give feedback on it. Did this happen?

13. what are “ideal” levels of acculturation and who decides what is ideal? (I suspect this would be better rephrased.)
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