Review of: "Effectiveness of a novel multi-modal intervention for family caregivers of persons with age-related macular degeneration: a randomised controlled trial"

Caitlin Crabb[1]

1 University of Illinois at Chicago

- The abstract says that the telephone counselling sessions were optional, but there is no reference to this in the text.

- In the Introduction, third paragraph, you discuss why M-CBT was used (so people could refer back to materials). This seems strange to me: couldn't CBT be delivered in-person and materials could also be provided during the in-person sessions? It doesn't seem like a strong enough reason to rely on M-CBT.

- I found the sample size difficult to follow throughout the text. I thought that the flow chart was helpful, but it appears that the demographic variables used the initial sample size. I suggest including the sample size in the demographic table. I also suggest describing how you calculated differences (and the p-values) between the two groups in terms of demographics in the text, even if you think it may be obvious, it's good practice. Additionally, when you talk about the satisfaction, it is hard to determine what that sample size is here. For instance, you state, "77% (n = 30) of participants reported that they were satisfied/very satisfied with the intervention." I suggest clarifying that n = 30 is the number of people in the intervention group that answered that question.

- You should indicate what high/low scores mean for each score (e.g., does a higher care burden score mean more burden?)

- Of course, many factors impact caregiving experiences, and unfortunately, this study didn't control for any of them due to the design.

- I do appreciate that you published this article even with a lack of statistically significant findings. However, I seriously question the usefulness of the intervention, even with your discussion of clinical significance.