

Moule and Hek(2011) claim that critiquing and reviewing other people's work is crucial as it provides positive and negative feedback to the authors to enable the paper to be improved. Author Services (2018) explains that accuracy, informative and to the point as the three key rules of a title. The title is the readers first connection to the article therefore the title is one crucial part of an article (Alimoradi et al,2016, pp.74-77). Hamilton et al. (2015) have clearly stated the title of their article using key terms for easier citation. The reader has clear understanding of the title.

The study is about family carers input in decision making, self-assessments and fighting for personal budgets that some mental health individuals are intitled to, also to enhance the well-being of the cared for. The personal budget scheme has been underused by people with mental health needs, as only 23% receiving social care services for this need is much lower to the other disability groups. The study has taken place to be able to understand why this figure is lower by exploring the experiences of family involvement in accessing and managing the personal budget due to the concern that the individual with the mental health problem may not feel able to complete the application by themselves (Hamilton et al, 2015).

All authors have provided input in conducting the research. This research article provides advantages to the research carried out due to all authors having the professional or academic background needed on this topic (Hamilton et al, 2015). Sarah Hamilton is a Doctor of Philosophy and holds a masters and Bachelor of Arts qualifications. Hamilton as the lead author was liable for comparing results and links from the information and these were examined with the other researchers to check the clarification. The biographical notes exhibit all researcher's backgrounds which has been analysed online to identify validity (The McPin Foundation, 2018).

Descriptive abstract was demonstrated in this article to be able to describe the main points and findings of the research (Hamilton et al, 2015). Considering the accurate key points of appropriate data such as the sample, method and findings the descriptive abstract is relevant and succinct (University of Bedfordshire, 2018). The descriptive abstract has served its purpose as the reader is enticed to know why there is tensions and implications for practitioners, family carers and local authorities on the matter of personal budgets (LaPlaca, Lindgreen and Vanhamme,2017).

Literature obtained within the study is displayed between 1995-2015. The authors have reviewed other relevant research studies from journals, care acts, websites, statistics, books and research articles to enable them to understand the collection of research which has been previously carried out on personal budgets and personal assistants (PA's). Literature dated from 1995 still serves its purpose due to what can be professionally be perceived as a carer (Twigg and Atkin, 1995). The authors have recognised this which may cause a discrepancy within the study. Some of Hamilton et al. (2015) literature review consists of a low take up in mental health personal budgets. The literature collected entails the usual practise of carers utilizing PA's, the effects on the family carers quality of life and effects regarding the application of personal budgets. The studies that Hamilton et al. (2015) gathered gives their study a purpose due to them gaining ideas of what to ask carers and

individuals in the interviews, to have a reason for the previous unanswered questions on experiences of personal budgets.

Adult social care statistics team (2013) shows the statistics for personal budgets received by individuals with a diagnosed mental health problem is much lower than other disability groups. This is relevant for the authors research, in order to find out from their interviews why family carers feel it is harder to access the personal budget scheme which can display some reasons for these statistics. Hamilton et al. (2015) have also collected data that has been reported by carers that they have experienced feeling left out by mental health services (Robinson et al, 2011). This relates to this study as findings from their interviews reveal that the relationship between carers and services as antagonistic which has resulted in carers making complaints towards local authorities. Another finding from their interview justifies the literature collected due to the carers presence in the assessment may reduce the support offered for the individual with mental health problems (Hamilton et al, 2015).

National Health Service Confederation (2015) accumulated the effects of personal budgets on individuals with mental health problems only. Newbrunner et al. (2011) provided a report regarding personal budgets. Previous research has been conducted regarding personal budgets but not on the viewpoint of family carers. This provides Hamilton et al. (2015) research with advantages due to providing experiences from carers and individuals with a mental health problem regarding personal budgets. This adds to the body of knowledge as readers have a better understanding on how the carers think and feel about their process of obtaining a personal budget and their perception on practitioners and local authority. Due to the advantage there are no other studies found that could have added to the review as the authors also demonstrated literature regarding the negative effects of this hypothesis.

An aim is important to give the authors a direction for the project (Couchman and Dawson, 1995, pp.7-10). Within the article the aim is not clearly stated by displaying "the aims of the study are" which provides a disadvantage for this paper, however, the abstract displays that the authors explored the roles carers undertake to support a family member with mental health problems using personal budgets (Hamilton et al, 2015).

Hamilton et al. (2015) described and justified the overall design for utilizing qualitative semi-structured interviews for their research. The authors have presented quotations of the interviews for qualitative research, on the other hand, the authors have not stated the use of displaying their findings through quantitative data. This provides a disadvantage for the article as the authors have displayed tables and numerical data within the paper which indicates that mixed methods are used to display their findings. Qualitative design was appropriate to answer the study purpose due to gathering the experiences first hand.

Eighteen family carers supporting an individual with mental health problems and twelve out of the intended fifty-two individuals themselves were the study population. The small sample chosen is suitable in qualitative studies due to the time it takes for transcribing and recording the data from interviews. The carers were identified

through snowballing via a national charity advert, however, carers were approached directly when service users declined to participate. Individuals with a mental health problem were selected through sites, practitioners or by local peer aid organisations. Hamilton et al. (2015) state that the sample was drawn for those who have accessed or in the process of accessing personal budgets. The authors have not declared which type of sampling was undertaken, therefore displays a weakness for this research. Due to the characteristics of the target sample, the sample used is purposive which the authors do not declare.

As thirty interviews were conducted due to the specific characteristics it could represent the study population regarding personal budgets as the samples were chosen from three local authorities which indicates three different locations. Due to the study only undertaken in England it may generalise in that country but may not generalise in different areas of the United Kingdom.

Semi structured interviews were conducted by the authors and have justified the reason for this data collection method because it gives the interviewer the opportunity to reply to the individuals (Hamilton et al,2015). Couchman and Dawson (1995, p.106) expresses that a semi-structured interview can be a positive collection tool as the interviewer can rephrase the question if the participant does not comprehend, therefore, this is a strength for the data collection tool used for their sample (Hamilton et al, 2015). Sturges and Hanrahan (2004) suggests that telephone and face to face interviews displays no differences in results, for this reason, this provides more strength to the authors choice for data collection tool of interviews. Opdenakker (2004) describes that a face to face interview provides the interviewer the opportunity to capture emotions and body language.

Ethics are important for the dignity and safety of individuals (Lobiondo-Wood and Haber, 1998, pp.275-284). The following needs to be displayed and explained to the participants to ensure that their dignity and safety is kept: consent of participants to participate, confidentiality, right to withdraw, purpose of the study, experiment should avoid all mental suffering, harm and injury (Lobiondo-Wood and Haber, 1998, pp.275-284). Hamilton et al. (2015) have gained ethical approval and displayed that they gained consent from participants, anonymity assured and sent out information to carers, on the other hand, the authors have not provided evidence that they expressed all of the ethical standards. There are some ethical concerns for this study due to the authors not displaying the right to withdraw, ensuring rights are not violated and that the experiment would avoid all mental suffering, harm and injury.

Interpretive framework approach was regulated, themes appear from the data. Four researchers coded the transcripts before being reviewed again to see if new themes appeared or had changed. Hamilton et al. (2015) provided their final themes within the article. Nvivo 9 software collected, summarised and coded the final framework (QSR International, 2018). Nvivo 9 is a computer software package designed for qualitative data analysis which was explained by the authors within the paper. All carers interviews were analysed, however automatic and manual searching was undertaken for the service user's interviews.

The lead author was liable for comparing results and links from the information and these were examined with the other researchers to check the interpretation (Hamilton et al, 2015). This provides details that the authors have provided accurate and trustworthy results due to multiple times of analysing the data through software and from the researchers themselves. Hamilton et al. (2015) audio-recorded and transcribed their data collected. Where consent was not taken to record, the interviewer undertook detailed notes during the interview.

The articles results were displayed clearly under common themes through paraphrasing and quotes which can be understood and interpreted. The findings were also displayed through a table and statistics, which were also described by the authors on how to interpret the statistics for clear citation. There are examples of quotations from the carer and cared for within the article (Hamilton et al, 2015). The data from eighteen family carers and twelve service users were obtained within the results.

One of the primary findings of the data is that there is a belief from the carers and service users that without the support of their carer that the service user would not have received a personal budget, therefore this provides the authors an understanding of the roles of family carers regarding personal budgets being received (Hamilton et al,2015).

Hamilton et al. (2015) discuss their findings in a balanced way as they demonstrate that carers can provide the maximum support for the service user, on the other hand, the presence of a carer can be used to reduce the support offered. By explaining their findings in a balanced way this provides the article with strengths due to not being bias. The discussion compares the authors findings to literature that was previously discussed in the introduction (Hamilton et al, 2015). Hamilton et al. (2015) state the answers to their aim to understand the roles of family carers in the use of personal budgets.

Providing limitations creates strength among the article as it suggests how the authors could address future research. Hamilton et al. (2015) present their limitations clearly by explaining that the authors were not able to recruit many minority ethnic carers. They also clarified that carers who were recruited through voluntary sector networks are likely to have greater knowledge and better informed rather than the general carer. Practitioners interviews provided limitations for the authors which resulted to excluding this data from the paper. Hamilton et al. (2015) states the implications of the study findings within the paper under study sites.

It is agreed that the authors have demonstrated valid conclusions based on their study findings from carers and service user's interviews. Due to these conclusions the authors recommend realistic suggestions for local authorities and practitioners to initiate. This provides considerable strength to the paper as the authors have considered real life applications. Hamilton et al. (2015) have advanced their article by explaining what further research can be implemented to provide richer data of the relationships between practitioners with carers.

Hamilton et al. (2015) have written in the third person and used relevant language which is logical and clear to follow. Hamilton et al. (2015) indicates some weaknesses within the paper, however, this does not cause any confusion for the reader because the paper provides a better understanding of the role of carers in the use of personal budgets. Recommendations for improvements on this paper would be that the authors to clearly state their aim, sample, all ethical standards obtained and the explanation that quantitative methods was used to display their findings to indicate the full research process for the reader.

References

Adult Social Care Statistics Team, Health and Social Care Information (2013) *Measures from the adult's social care outcomes framework, England: 2012-2013. Final release.* Department of Health and Social Care: London

Alimoradi, F. et al. (2016) *The effect of key characteristics of the title and morphological features of published articles on their citation rates.* *Annals of Library and Information Studies.* Vol.63, pp.74-77. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35278477.pdf> (Accessed 04/12/2018)

Author services (2018) *Your title is your headline.* Available at: <https://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/abstracts-and-titles/#> (Accessed 04/12/2018)

Couchman, W. and Dawson, J. (1995) *Nursing and health care research.* 2nd ed. London: Scutari Press

Hamilton, S., et al. (2015) *The role of family carers in the use of personal budgets by people with mental health problems.* 25(1) pp.158-166.

LaPlaca, P., Lindgreen, A. and Vanhamme, J. (2017) How to write really good articles for premier academic journals: An article's abstract. Pp. 202-209. Available at: https://ac-els-cdn-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/S001985011730874X/1-s2.0-S001985011730874X-main.pdf?_tid=a8594e75-16c8-4da3-94ad-8119a20b6ca6&acdnat=1544100825_bfd335b93ca4b41a1745ea59bc4923c3 (Accessed 06/12/2018)

Lobiondo-Wood, G. and Haber, J. (1998) *Nursing research: methods, critical appraisal, and utilization.* United States of America: Mosby

Moule, P. and Hek, G. (2011) *Making sense of research: An introduction for health and social care practitioners.* 4th Ed. London: Sage

National Health Service Confederation (2015) *Briefing: Personal budgets in mental health.* (284) pp.1-14. Available at: https://www.nhsconfed.org/-/media/Confederation/Files/public-access/Personal-budgets-in-mental-health-FINAL_2-April.pdf (Accessed 10/12/2018)

Newbronner et al. (2011) *Keeping Personal Budgets Personal: Learning from the experiences of older people, people with mental health problems and their carer's.* Research Report. Adults' Services Report, 40. London: Social Care Institute for Excellence

Opdenakker, R. (2006) *Advantages and Disadvantages of Four Interview Techniques in Qualitative Research.* 7(4) Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/175/391> (Accessed 17/12/2018)

QSR Internationals (2018) *Helping you discover the rich insights from humanized data*. Available at: <https://www.qsrinternational.com> (Accessed 17/12/2018)

Robinson, C.A., et al. (2011) Supporting carers for people with mental health problems: Needs Assessment to Service Provision. Bangor: Bangor University

Sturges, J.E. and Hanrahan, K.J. (2004) *Comparing Telephone and Face-to-Face Qualitative Interviewing: A Research Note*. 4 (1) Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1468794104041110> (Accessed 17/12/2018)

The McPin Foundation (2018) *Blogs by Sarah Hamilton*. Available at: <http://mcpin.org/blogger/sarah-hamilton/> (Accessed 29/12/2018)

Twigg, J. and Atkin, K. (1995) *Carers Perceived*. Buckingham: Open university Press

University of Bedfordshire (2018) *Critiquing a journal article: critiquing the abstract*. Available at: https://lrweb.beds.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/502042/Critiquing-a-journal-article.pdf (Accessed 06/12/2018)