IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 18 · Issue 3 · e150346

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Self-management in Older Adults with Multiple Chronic Conditions (MCCs): A Qualitative Content Analysis

Hajar Sadeghi, Farahnaz Mohammadi Shahbolaghi, Mohammadali Hosseini, Masoud Fallahi-Khoshknab, Gholamreza Ghaedamini Harouni

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Jun 2024	10 Jul 2024	17 Jul 2024	10.5812/ijpbs-150346

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

4 comments · 2 Jul 2024 – 8 Jul 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 2 Jul 2024

Considering the growth of the elderly population in Iran and the importance of maintaining and improving the health of patients in this age group, conducting research on the management of diseases in the elderly is very important. Such studies will play an important role in macro health policies.
I reviewed the present study. The text of the article is written very carefully and there is no ambiguity in the method and findings of the article.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 6 Jul 2024

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper titled “Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis”.

I evaluated the manuscript based on the SRQR and COREQ guidelines. The study is innovative and well-conducted, addressing an important topic. The writing is clear, the methodology suits the research questions, and the results support the authors' conclusions. However, I have some minor remarks regarding this article, as outlined below:

* Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.

* Is the study focused on the Iranian elderly population or on an international elderly population? Please specify.

* In the data analysis section, explain the researcher's process for analyzing the data after outlining the steps based on references. Corrected (pages 4 and 5)

* In the conclusion, concentrate on summarizing the study's findings and their relevance to nursing and healthcare systems.

* For the rigor of the study, it is suggested that you explain separately what action was taken for each of the four criteria (credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability).

* Who did you mean by colleagues, and what were their specializations? (During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.)

* It is also suggested that you make suggestions for further studies based on the results.

* Revise the conclusion to avoid repetition and ensure alignment with the study results.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 7 Jul 2024

Reviewer 1
Title:
"Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis"
It is better to remove "Psychosocial and biological factors" from the title.

Introduction
If possible, reduce the length of the introduction.
Methods
1. In the methods section, the spelling of Elo and Kyngä should be corrected.
2. The method is described, but it would be necessary to explain a little more about trustworthiness.

3. Were relevant checklists for qualitative studies used to write the study? If yes, it is recommended to include them in a supplementary file. As mentioned in many checklists for evaluating qualitative studies, it is necessary to mention the following in the methodology section for greater clarity:

1. Was a relationship established before the study commenced?
2. What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? E.g., bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic.
3. What did the participants know about the researcher?
4. Was a relationship established before the study commenced?
5. How were participants approached? E.g., face-to-face, telephone, mail, email, …
6. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? What were their reasons?
7. Where were the data collected? (What was meant by a private place?)
8. Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?
9. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?
10. What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?

What kind of people, with what specialization, did you mean by colleagues? ("During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.")
Results:

- Some categories have two subcategories,
such as extra-organizational factors (cultural factors and social factors).
How do you evaluate the economic factors?
- The title of table number one should be corrected.

Do the researchers have a specific reason for separating economic and social factors?

In the discussion section, the whole paragraph containing "Zhu et al. (2023) identified the early identification" should be reviewed. Correct the English.

Corrections should be highlighted in the text, and explanations of points requiring clarification should be attached in a separate file.

Reviewer 2
Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper titled: “Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis”.
I evaluated the manuscript based on the SRQR and COREQ guidelines. The study is innovative and well-conducted, addressing an important topic. The writing is clear, the methodology suits the research questions, and the results support the authors' conclusions. However, I have some minor remarks regarding this article, as outlined below:
* Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from:
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.
* Is the study focused on the Iranian elderly population or an international elderly population? Please specify.
* In the data analysis section, explain the researcher's process for analyzing the data after outlining the steps based on references. Corrected (pages 4 and 5)

* In the conclusion, concentrate on summarizing the study's findings and their relevance to nursing and healthcare systems.
* For the rigor of the study, it is suggested to explain separately what action was taken for each of the four criteria (credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability).
* What kind of people, with what specialization, did you mean by colleagues? ("During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.")
* It is also suggested to make suggestions for further studies based on the results.
* Revise the conclusion to avoid repetition and ensure alignment with the study results.

Reviewer 3

Considering the growth of the elderly population in Iran and the importance of maintaining and improving the health of patients in this age group, conducting research on the management of diseases in the elderly is very important. Such studies will play an important role in macro health policies.
I reviewed the present study. The text of the article is written very carefully, and there is no ambiguity in the method and findings of the article.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 8 Jul 2024

Thank you for submitting your manuscript for consideration for publication in the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

After revision, authors are obliged to upload a Word file containing the reviewers' comments and their responses to all comments, one by one.

Besides, please pay attention to the word count limit:
Word count limits are declared at this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences. Revised text must be highlighted in the full manuscript file.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the paper titled: “Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis”.

I evaluated the manuscript based on the SRQR and COREQ guidelines. The study is innovative and well-conducted, addressing an important topic. The writing is clear, the methodology suits the research questions, and the results support the authors' conclusions. However, I have some minor remarks regarding this article, as outlined below:

* Verify and update the keywords using MeSH terms from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh.

Checked out.

*Is the study focused on the Iranian elderly population or international? Please specify.

This study employed a qualitative approach to examine the factors influencing self-management in Iranian older adults with MCCs (Page 2).

* In the data analysis section, explain the researcher's process for analyzing the data after outlining the steps based on references.

It was highlighted.

* In the conclusion, concentrate on summarizing the study's findings and their relevance to nursing and healthcare systems.

It was highlighted.

*For the Rigor of the study, it is suggested to explain separately what action was taken for each of the four criteria(credibility, dependability, confirmability, and transferability.

In this research, the researcher aimed to establish a proper relationship with the participants and enhance credibility through long-term involvement and complete immersion in the data. To Peer debriefing by colleagues, the interviews along with extracted codes were presented to several colleagues to confirm the researcher's perceptions. During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues. The researchers have 10-30 years of experience in theoretical and clinical training on chronic diseases and working with older adult patients with MCCs. In this research, the triangulation of the researcher involved more than one researcher participating in collecting, analyzing, or interpreting the data, which helps increase the credibility of the qualitative aspect of the study. Triangulation of the data sources included participants with different levels of experience (older adults, caregivers, and experts) selected for

data collection.The researcher provided a detailed description of the research setting, participants, sampling method, and data collection timeframe. The methods were presented to experts for review, and supervisors also provided feedback. To validate the researcher's efforts, it was essential to accurately document and report the research steps and decisions made during the process, enabling others to replicate the study if necessary.

*What kind of people with what specialization did you mean by colleagues? (During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.)
Expert professors of qualitative research, gerontology, nursing, and research teams.

*It is also suggested to make suggestions for further studies based on the results.
corrections were made.
* Revise the conclusion to avoid repetition and ensure alignment with the study results.
corrections were made.

Title:
"Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis"

It is better to remove Psychosocial and biological factors from the title.
Hello, Correction done.

introduction

If possible, reduce the volume of the introduction.

Methods
1. In the working method section, the spelling of Elo and Kyngä should be corrected. Elo and Kyngäs
2. The method is described but it would be necessary to explain a little more about trustworthiness.

In this research, the researcher aimed to establish a proper relationship with the participants and enhance credibility through long-term involvement and complete immersion in the data. To Peer debriefing by colleagues, the interviews along with extracted codes were presented to several colleagues to confirm the researcher's perceptions. During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues. The researchers have 10-30 years of experience in

theoretical and clinical training on chronic diseases and working with older adult patients with MCCs. In this research, the triangulation of the researcher involved more than one researcher participating in collecting, analyzing, or interpreting the data, which helps increase the credibility of the qualitative aspect of the study. Triangulation of the data sources included participants with different levels of experience (older adults, caregivers, and experts) selected for data collection. The researcher provided a detailed description of the research setting, participants, sampling method, and data collection timeframe. The methods were presented to experts for review, and supervisors also provided feedback. To validate the researcher's efforts, it was essential to accurately document and report the research steps and decisions made during the process, enabling others to replicate the study if necessary.

3. Were relevant checklists of qualitative studies used to write the study? If yes, it is recommended to bring it as a supplementary file. -As mentioned in many qualitative studies valuation checklists, it is necessary to mention the following in the methodology section for more clarity:

1. Was a relationship established before the study commencement?
2. What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic
3. What did the participants know about the researcher?
4. Was a relationship established before the study commencement?
5. How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email,…
6. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?
7. Where was the data collected? (What was meant by private place?)
8. Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?
9. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?
10. What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?

The COREQ checklist was used and is attached.

What kind of people with what specialization did you mean by colleagues? (During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.)

Expert professors of qualitative research, gerontology, nursing, and research teams.

Results;

Some categories have two subcategories. such as extra-organizational factors (cultural factors and social factors)**.**
How, do you evaluate the economic factors? Do researchers have a special reason to separate economic and social factors?
Economic factors have been examined in the class of individual factors. Because it is a strong individual predictor in this field.

-The title of table number one should be corrected.
Correction done.

In the discussion section, "Zhu et al. (2023) identified the early identification", the whole paragraph should be reviewed. Correct the English. Correction done.

Corrective items should be highlighted in the text and places that need explanation should be attached in a separate file.

Reviewer 2:

Title:
"Psychosocial and biological factors associated with self-management in elderly with multiple chronic conditions (MCC): qualitative content analysis"

It is better to remove Psychosocial and biological factors from the title.
Hello, Correction done.

introduction

If possible, reduce the volume of the introduction.

Methods
1. In the working method section, the spelling of Elo and Kyngä should be corrected. Elo and Kyngäs
2. The method is described but it would be necessary to explain a little more about trustworthiness.

In this research, the researcher aimed to establish a proper relationship with the participants and enhance credibility through long-term involvement and complete immersion in the data. To Peer debriefing by colleagues, the interviews along with extracted codes were presented to several colleagues to confirm the researcher's perceptions. During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues. The researchers have 10-30 years of experience in

theoretical and clinical training on chronic diseases and working with older adult patients with MCCs. In this research, the triangulation of the researcher involved more than one researcher participating in collecting, analyzing, or interpreting the data, which helps increase the credibility of the qualitative aspect of the study. Triangulation of the data sources included participants with different levels of experience (older adults, caregivers, and experts) selected for data collection. The researcher provided a detailed description of the research setting, participants, sampling method, and data collection timeframe. The methods were presented to experts for review, and supervisors also provided feedback. To validate the researcher's efforts, it was essential to accurately document and report the research steps and decisions made during the process, enabling others to replicate the study if necessary.

3. Were relevant checklists of qualitative studies used to write the study? If yes, it is recommended to bring it as a supplementary file. -As mentioned in many qualitative studies valuation checklists, it is necessary to mention the following in the methodology section for more clarity:

1. Was a relationship established before the study commencement?
2. What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons, and interests in the research topic
3. What did the participants know about the researcher?
4. Was a relationship established before the study commencement?
5. How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email,…
6. How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?
7. Where was the data collected? (What was meant by private place?)
8. Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?
9. Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?
10. What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?

The COREQ checklist was used and is attached.

What kind of people with what specialization did you mean by colleagues? (During the analysis process, the findings of the study were discussed with colleagues.)

Expert professors of qualitative research, gerontology, nursing, and research teams.

Results;

Some categories have two subcategories. such as extra-organizational factors (cultural factors and social factors)**.**
How, do you evaluate the economic factors? Do researchers have a special reason to separate economic and social factors?
Economic factors have been examined in the class of individual factors. Because it is a strong individual predictor in this field.

-The title of table number one should be corrected.
Correction done.

In the discussion section, "Zhu et al. (2023) identified the early identification", the whole paragraph should be reviewed. Correct the English. Correction done.

Corrective items should be highlighted in the text and places that need explanation should be attached in a separate file.

Reviewer 3:

Thank you for your attention and time.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 13 Jul 2024 – 17 Jul 2024

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 13 Jul 2024

accept

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 13 Jul 2024

Hello
Corrections related to rigor and completion of the checklist of work methods have been made. There is no need for re-review, and it is approved.
thanks

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 17 Jul 2024

We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is being considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized with your cooperation in the editorial process.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.