IJ Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Volume 17 · Issue 2 · e79672

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Efficacy of a Home Care Plan in the Mental Health of Burn Survivors: A Randomized Clinical Trial

Nastaran Heydarikhayat, Tahereh Ashktorab, Farid Zayeri, Camelia Rohani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 May 2018	14 Mar 2023	4 Apr 2023	10.5812/ijpbs-79672

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 Referee 1, Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9
4 Revision 3 Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 13

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Answer to reviewers

The opinion of Reviewer 1:

Q- According to the questionnaire, change the title of the article to the: The Effect of Home Care on the "mental health" of Burn Survivors

R- Title was changed and the “mental health” was added in key words.

Q- The analysis used in this article should be changed. Please use (t-paired, ANOVA with repeated measures, follow-up tests such as S-N-K, Duncan, Sheffe and Tukey).

R- The analysis was conducted base on the reviewers’ opinions.

The opinion of Reviewer 2:

Q- Use the valid reverences for nursing intervention in home care.

R-Valid references for nursing intervention in home care was added. It should be noted that are not study including home care for burn patients in Iran and other countries.

Q= Please explain the method more precisely.

Q=Discuss the intervention with more details.

Q- How have the home care sessions been implemented? And by whom?

Q-Have the interventions and educations been based on the book or articles?

R= Method of the study and the intervention was discussed precisely.

Q-Please mention the college degree of the person who implement the interventions.

R- University degree of psychologists and psychiatric nurse was written.

Q-Explain validity and reliability of the instrument

R= Validity and reliability of the instrument was discussed.

Q- It is suggested that data should be re-analyzed by repeated measure ANOVA to determine in which stage intervention had been effective.

R- The analysis was conducted and the findings were included in the article.

The opinion of reviewer 3:

Q-Materials and Methods:

How authors assigned inclusion criteria (No history of severe psychological disorders) in the part of results line three author mentioned that (Also, 30% of all subjects attempted suicide.) attempted to suicide isn't psychological disorders?

R- The mistake was found and edited.
Q-Why did not the authors use blind techniques?

R-The method of blindness was written.
Result:
Q-The authors mentioned that two groups were homologous in term of demographic, except for gender but in table 1 p valve for gender is 0.66

R-It was rechecked and edited.
Q-It would be better if the authors write the ANOVA test in a chart or table

R-The table was inserted in the results.
References:
Q-Please check references for consistency

R- References was checked.

The opinion of reviewer 4:
Q-the title for introduction does not exist.

R-The word “introduction” was added at the beginning of introduction.
Q. please write some limitations that you experienced in doing this study.

R-Some limitations was written.
Q.The code of ethics committee must write.

R-The code of ethic was inserted in the article.
Q.please write the year of all studies that you mentioned in the discussion based on journal guideline. for example Levi et . al(2008).

R-The time was added based on the opinion.
Q.please write some suggestions for further researches in the future in the conclusion

R-Some suggestions were added at the end of the discussion.

The native edition of the manuscript was done.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

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.

Response to reviewers

Reviewer 1	
Title 1- Please eliminate the name of author below of title 2- Please write efficacy instead of effect in the title and all of the manuscript	1-The name of author was eliminated 2-The effect was replaced by efficacy, page 1, 3, 10 and line: 1, 67, 221
Abstract *1- Please mention the statistical tests* *2- Sampling method should be mentioned* *3- Please mention groups of study exactly*	1-the statistical tests were added. Page 1, line 15 and 16. 2-sampling method was added. Page1, line 10 3-the authors re-read the abstract and we used the intervention and control group. We don't understand what the reviewer meant exactly.
Method *1- This sentence: "This article is extracted from a doctoral dissertation in Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences" is not necessary to express.* *2- Reference should be written according to Vancouver format, please edit some error* *3- based on which references "d" that used in sample size calculation determined 7*	1-The sentence *"This article is extracted from a doctoral dissertation in Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences" was deleted from the beginning of the method.* *2-Two mistakes in reporting the study of Noorbala and Ebrahimi were edited in method in page 4, lines 95 and 96* *3-The reference was added. Page 3, line 75*
Discussion *1- please disclose new questions for future research* *2- what was the Clinical application of your study?* *3- Reference should be written according to Vancouver format, please edit some error*	1-New question page 13, line 292-93. 2-The clinical implications were added in page 12, 13- line 282 to 290. 3- Errors in references was edited.
Reviewer 2	
1- Identification as a randomized trial in the title *2- Modify key words based on mesh* *3- Duration of sampling was from July 2016 to April 2018 (methods) or July 2016 to September 2017 (Abstract)?*	1- The title was changed based on the comment. 2- Key words modified based on the Mesh but there is an issue it is better to use home care not home care services. Based on the intervention we prefer the "home care". 3-The exact time was written in the abstract. Page 1, line 10

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 14 Oct 2019 – 27 Nov 2019

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 14 Oct 2019

The problem statement requires substantial revision.
The methods lack sufficient coherence.
The discussion needs revision.
The English translation of the abstract needs revision, and the abstract must also be shortened.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 27 Nov 2019

Thank you for making the corrections, but there are still some problems that should be addressed.
reviewer 1
The statement of the problem should be revised.
In the methods section, the manuscript lacks integration.
The discussion should be modified according to the comments in the Word file.
The abstract also needs some editing.
reviewer 2
Please download the attached file and consider all the peer-review comments.

4

Revision 3

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.

Dear Editor of Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and behavioral Sciences

I would like to thank you and all the reviewers who read the manuscript and released their valuable comments for improving of our manuscript (ID: 79672- **The Efficacy of a Home Care Plan on the Mental Health of Burn Survivors: A Randomized Clinical Trial**.

The comments of the reviewers were read and answered point by point. All changes and points in the manuscript were shown by the underlined and highlighted text.

Best Regards,

Research team

Response to reviewers	
Reviewers	Response
Abstract	
1- The number of words in the abstract should be in accordance with the journal format.	The number of words in the abstract decreased.
Introduction	**Response**
The problem statement is not structured. It should start with the percentage and importance of burns, then the complications of burns, mortality, costs, care burden, etc., and finally the importance of mental health in burns. The existing strategies and the strategy that the researcher has tested.	It was edited based on the reviewer's comment.
In the final paragraph of the problem statement, the necessity of the intervention should be explained in detail.	It was edited.
Method	**Response**
How was the selection done?	The sample selection method is explained on page 3, lines 20-29.
Up to what maximum age?	18-80 years was added in the methods.
Based on which scale was the extent of the burn assessed?	Classification of Burn% was done based on these two study: 1-Initial management of a major burn: I—overview, Shehan Hettiaratchy, 2-Guideline and treatment algorithm for burn injuries, Ahmet Çınar Yastı

Are the steps of the method not written in an orderly and systematic manner?	The method was edited based on the referee's opinion
What is meant by fast psychiatrics' appointments ????????!!!	It was edited in the text.
In the study aim you have written 6 months after the intervention!!!! Therefore, you need to correct the aim.	A period of 3 months was added to the object section.
Please rewrite.	It was edited in the text.
Is it necessary to state the significance level?	It was removed from the text.
Discussion	
This sentence is not an appropriate start for the Discussion; please refer to the main result of your work.	The sentences at the beginning of the discussion were edited.
Your aim is not description; do not divert the Discussion of the article toward the results of the data description.	Unnecessary parts were removed.
Conclusion:	
In no part of the article have you clarified whether you mean psychiatric interventions or nursing care interventions; you have written it very ambiguously.	The conclusion was edited and rewrite.
Limitation	
The limitations of your study are very serious and in a way have called the work into question. What were your strategies for reducing your limitations?	1- Paying for the patient's travel expenses 2- Paying for charging the phone 3- Making an appointment with a psychiatrist for the patient
Acknowledgment:	
First, you should thank the patient.	It was edited.
References	
45 percent of the cited sources were published more than 5 years ago. The sources should be recent and need to be corrected; in addition, some of the content of the text, especially in the Discussion section, is redundant.	New refrences were included.

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 2 Apr 2023 – 4 Apr 2023

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT 2 Apr 2023

Thanks.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 2 Apr 2023

Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 4 Apr 2023

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 editorial processing.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.