OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.95653
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(4); e95653

Peer Review Report for "Determining the Consequences of Perceived Self-Care Ability in Stroke Patients Living at Home: A Qualitative Study in Iran"

Author(s): Nasrin Jafari-Golestan, Mohammadali Hosseini, Asghar Dalvandi, Masoud Fallahi- Khoshknab, Abbas Ebadi, Mahdi Rahgozar, Souraya Sidani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Jun 2019
Revised Date:	7 Aug 2019
Accepted Date:	21 Aug 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
In order to the duration of stroke, acute stands for less than 1 month, subacute means 1 to 3-6 months & chronic means more than this.
In the 4th line of the method section, the author mentions: in chronic stroke more than 1 month, in my opinion, this should correct.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
I read the paper with great interest and found it a valuable one that needs some revisions before publication.
- The title, and objectives are not matched with each other, so I highly recommend you to revise both and make it more understandable for the audience.
- The inclusion and exclusion criteria need to be revised as below:

Patients with a history of a stroke that lasts at least one month after it, if having the ability to express oneself and willing to participate were eligible. Those with cognitive status survey score < 21, functional independence measure (FIM) score < 22 were excluded. Those with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and
live at home independently, were also eligible.
- The authors have mentioned that "individuals with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and lived at home independently, were included in this study." Is this statement compatible with the other mentioned criteria about FIM and CSS scores?
- Sampling method is not clear. How exactly you find the participants? From the patients discharged from a specific department or from the patients of a clinic for example? Please explain in detail.
- It is better not to mention the number of participants in methods.
- The authors have to present the baseline characteristics of the participants at the beginning of the Results.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 17 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 Jul 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear Reviewer 1:

Reviewer 1:

1. The title, and objectives are not matched with each other, so I highly recommend you to revise both and make it more understandable for the audience

Title: Determining the Consequences of perceived self-care ability in stroke patients living at home: A qualitative study in Iran

2. The inclusion and exclusion criteria need to be revised as below: Patients with a history of a stroke that lasts at least one month after it, if having the ability to express oneself and willing to participate were eligible. Those with cognitive status survey score < 21, functional independence measure (FIM) score < 22 were excluded. Those with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and lived at home independently, were also eligible.

Page 3 and 4- Line 22…..:

Patients with a history of a chronic phase of stroke (more than 1 month after it), if having the ability to express oneself and willing to participate were eligible. Those with cognitive status survey score < 21, functional independence measure (FIM) score < 22 were excluded. Those with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and lived at home independently, were also eligible.

3. You have mentioned that "individuals with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and lived at home independently, were included in this study." Is this statement compatible with the other mentioned criteria about FIM and CSS scores?

Page 3 and 4- Line 22…..:

Patients with a history of a chronic phase of stroke (more than 1 month after it), if having the ability to express oneself and willing to participate were eligible. Those with cognitive status survey score < 21, functional independence measure (FIM) score < 22 were excluded. Those with hemiparesis or hemiplegia, who could walk to the bathroom with a cane or walker and lived at home independently, were also eligible.

4. Sampling method is not clear. How exactly you find the participants? From the patients discharged from a specific department or from the patients of a clinic for example? Please explain in details.

Page 4-First Paragraph

In this research, the unit of analysis was considered at the individual level and Samples were selected using purposive sampling. The setting for interviewing patients was their homes. But, apart from one of the interviews, the rest were reluctant to conduct interviews at home. Therefore, by referring to reputable rehab centers in the city of Tehran, according to the criteria for entering the study, patients diagnosed with stroke, and when referring to patients with stroke to visit or conduct rehab programs in due time designated by the center , He coordinated the interviews with the patients. Samples were selected and interviews were conducted.

5. It is better to do not mention the number of participants in methods.
(Male, married, 63 years old):

6. 6- You have to present the baseline characteristics of the participants at the beginning of the Results.

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of samples

Number of Stroke attacks	duration after stroke	Marriage	Setting	Education Degree	Job	Age	Sex	Row
First	One Month	Husband died	Besat	Elementary	Housewife	73	Female	1
Second	3 years	Husband died	Besat	Elementary	Housewife	87	Female	2
First	1 years	Abandoned	Khanevadeh	High school	Housewife	72	Female	3
Ffirst	3 Month	Living with Husband	Rofeideh	Diploma	Servant of the house	50	Female	4
Ffirst	7 Month	Living with Husband	Rofeideh	Diploma	Housewife	49	Female	5
Third	3 years	Living with Husband	Rofeideh	Diploma	Housewife	48	Female	6
Ffirst	20 Days	Living with Husband	Besat	Illiterate	Housewife	55	Female	7
Ffirst	7 Month	Husband died	Home	Diploma	Emeritus teacher	76	Female	8
Second	7 years	Living with wife	Rofeideh	Diploma	Emeritus	63	Male	9
Ffirst	7 Month	Living with wife	Rofeideh	Doctor	Dentist	60	Male	10

Dear Reviewer 2:

Reviewer 2:

1. *In order to the duration of stroke, acute stands for less than 1 month, subacute means 1 to 3-6 month & chronic means more than this.*
   In the 4th line of method section the author mentions: in chronic stroke more than 1 month, in my opinion this should correct.

Page 3- Line 4. Result .The chronic phase of stroke is more than 1 month.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 24 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
As I mentioned in the previous review, The author should mention that they entered the study the patients in the sub acute & chronic phase of stroke, instead of only the chronic phase.
Thanks indeed.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 3 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
I received the revised paper for the second round of peer review. In my opinion, the revisions are acceptable.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 7 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 7 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

:Dear Reviewer 2

1. **As I mentioned in the previous review, the author should mention that they entered the study the patients in the sub-acute & chronic phase of stroke, instead of only chronic phase.**

Page 3. Methods. Line 2, 4, 5 revised

This qualitative study was conducted using the content analysis approach in Iran in 2018. Ten independent home-dwelling patients in the sub-acute & chronic phase of stroke were included in this study. One patient was interviewed at home, while nine patients were interviewed in the rehabilitation centers of Tehran, Iran.

The sub-acute & chronic phase of stroke is more than 1 month.

Patients with a history of a sub-acute & chronic phase of stroke (more than 1 month after it), if

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
All comments added to the article. It is now ready for publishing.
Thanks indeed,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 20 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The revisions are acceptable. The manuscript is now ready for publication.
Kind Regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 21 Aug 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 21 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.