Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Volume 15 · Issue 1 · e141029

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Parental Stress and Quality of Life Among Iranian Parents of Hearing-Impaired Children with Cochlear Implantation History: A Cross-sectional and Descriptive-Correlational Study

Atena Hakimzadeh, Seyedeh Narjes Mousavizadeh, Amirhossein Shafighi, Fereshteh Javaheri Tehrani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Sep 2023	22 Nov 2023	24 Nov 2023	10.5812/jcp-141029

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, Reza Tavakolizadeh, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Reza Tavakolizadeh, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 14
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 15
Authors' reply to reviewers 16
Reviewer and editor comments 24

1 Original submission

4 comments · 22 Sep 2023 – 7 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 22 Sep 2023

dear authors. Thank you for your valuable efforts. Some points noted during the manuscript review are summarized below (more details are provided in the PDF file):
1_Please review the introduction as a whole and replace unnecessarily long passages with shorter, meaningful, goal-directed statements relevant to the main topic of the manuscript.
2_At the end of the study, the main idea of the manuscript should be pointed out.
3_The objective and methods should be explained precisely and in detail. Please consult with a statistics specialist.
4_Because the participants were only those who had undergone cochlear implant surgery (NOT ALL HI patients), this should be pointed out in the title and all other parts of the manuscript.
5_Because the population in this study consists of patients with CI (NOT HI), the results should be compared with those from similar populations (NOT ALL HI) in the discussion section. Many of the conflicting results are due to differences in study populations and methods.

Reza Tavakolizadeh Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 7 Oct 2023

-I would like to thank the author or authors of the article for their hard work and good assessment of the situation of families.

-It is necessary to edit the article into natural English.

-The fact that the children in all the investigated families had previously undergone cochlear implant surgery should be clearly mentioned in the title and summary of the article and throughout the article. There is also no information available on how successful this process has been.

-I did not understand the reason for doing this study. It is certain that parental stress can have a negative impact on the quality of life in the family. You have investigated parental stress in families of hearing-impaired children and concluded that parental stress has a strong and inverse relationship with family quality of life. This is an obvious fact. And as stated, it has nothing to do with the presence of hearing impairment in the child. Perhaps it would be better to examine parental stress in families of children with this hearing defect before and after cochlear surgery.

-Abbreviations should be used correctly. For example, QOL is used many times before it is defined for the first time as quality of life on the second page of the article.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2023

Dear EIC,
I thank the authors and express my appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript has some major flaws, as also mentioned by the reviewers. The study design should be mentioned in the first line of the method section of the ABSTRACT.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2023

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting the article. It needs some revision. Please revise it based on the reviewers' and AE's comments. We can decide about it after revision.

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.

Reply to Reviewers (141029)

The Evaluation of Parental Stress and the Quality of Life among Iranian Parents of Hearing Impaired Children with Cochlear Implantation History: A Cross-Sectional and Descriptive-Correlational Study

Dear EIC

First, I would like to appreciate you for spending your valuable time in reviewing our manuscript (ID 141029).

We are sorry for our misunderstanding in the process of re-submitting the revision. Based on you and your colleagues' valuable comments, we have edited the whole manuscript. Still, we are fully ready for any potential further amendments or revisions.

This is a great honor for us to participate in the reviewing process of your journal.

kind regards

Reviewer 1:

-I would like to thank the author or authors of the article for their hard work and good assessment of the situation of families

A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion.

-It is necessary to make the article native in English.

A. It is fully considered and highlighted.

-The fact that all the investigated families had previously performed cochlear implant surgery on their child should be clearly mentioned in the title and summary of the article and the entire article. There is also no information available on how successful this process has been.

A. Based on your valuable comment, CI was added in both title and whole manuscript (Highlighted). Furthermore, some information about CI were added.

-I did not understand the reason for doing this study. It is certain that parental stress can have a negative impact on the quality of life in family. You have investigated parental stress in hearing impaired children and concluded that parental stress has a strong and inverse relationship with family quality of life. This is an obvious fact. And as it was said, it has nothing to do with the presence of hearing impairment of the child. Perhaps it would be better to examine the parents stress of families of children with this hearing defect before and after cochlear surgery.

A. Undoubtedly, what you said is correct and could improve the current research. But unfortunately, in the current study, the conditions of participants before and after the surgery were not considered, and the main focus was only on measuring PS and QOL. What we know about the participants' condition before surgery is limited to their medical records (medical history of physical and especially psychological disorders) and the fact that HI children can make their family stressed and diminish their QOL (based on many studies). Therefore, the reason for implementing the current study was to assess the PS among HI children with CI history (NOT ALL HI CHILDREN). In other words, to assess if CI surgery can improve QOL and reduce PS in families of HI children or not? (What is the difference between HI children with and without CI). Moreover, another important innovation of current study is its methodology. That is, not only it analyzed the linear correlation between PS-HI and QOL-HI, it covers the multidimensional correlation HI-PS-QOL.

-The use of abbreviations should be done in the correct way, for example, after many times using of (QOL), for the first time on the second page of the article, its definition has been discussed that (QOL) is the quality of life.

A. What you suggest is totally correct. Sorry for mistakes. We have corrected them.

Reviewer 2:
dear authors. thanks for your valuable efforts. there are some points that indicated on manuscript review that summarized below:(more details in pdf file)

A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion. (COMMENTS OF PDF WERE ANSWERED IN NEXT PAGE)

1_plz review the introduction part as whole and replace too long unnecessary parts with smaller and meaning-full, goal directed statements according to main topic of manuscript.

A. Based on your valuable comment, we revised the whole introduction; some parts were summarized, some details were added and the importance of implementing the current study were mentioned (ALL WERE HIGHLIGHTED IN MAIN MANUSCRIPT).

2_at the end of study the main idea of manuscript should be pointed

A. The main idea were added based on your comment.

3_objective and methods should be explained exactly with details. plz consult with an Statistics specialist.

A. According to your valuable comment, we revised the methodology and added some more important details (HIGHLIGHTED).

4_because the participants were just ones that had cochlear implant surgery (NOT ALL HI patients) this should be pointed in Title and all other parts of manuscript.

A. It is totally correct. We have added that based on your comment.

5_because the population in this study are patients of CI (NOT HI) the results should be compared with similar population (NOT ALL HI) in discussion part. many of contrary results is due to different study populations and methods.

A. According to your valuable comment, we have changed the whole DISCUSSION as far as it was possible; many unrelated studies were removed; reciprocally, many related studies were added.

Associate Editor 1:

1- *Dear EIC,*
Thanks to the authors and appreciation to the researchers. The manuscript has some major flaws as mentioned by reviewers also Study design should be mentioned in first line of method section of ABSTRACT

A: Great thanks for your valuable opinion. We have considered that and have added that based on your valuable comment.

PDF:

-plz insert type of study in title section(rct, cross sectional,case control ,...)

A: Dear EIC
Thanks for spending your valuable time to read the manuscript. The specified items have been corrected and highlighted (as yellow) in the main manuscript. So, title has been changed.

- secondary or primary consequences should be described or, if its not possible, deleted.

A: It has been deleted

-should be described for first time.

A: It has been corrected.

-should be described for first time.

A: It has been corrected.

-what means accidental? correct the statement with academic terms. the text should be reviewed with a Naive English

A: It has been corrected.

-review plz.

A: It has been corrected.

-what means?

A: It has been corrected and highlighted as yellow in main file.

-description of stress is not necessary

A: it has been deleted.

-plz summarize this section if possible.

A: It has been summarized

-because this part is not directly related to title topic,plz summarize in shorter segments.

A: It has been summarized and corrected.

-its not a true academic term.plz correct.

A: it has been deleted.

-plz insert a true academic term.

A: it has been corrected.

-description of QOL is not necessary. in introduction we should point what we know, what we dont know and whats the aim and novelty of our study.
plz review the introduction part as whole and replace too long unnecessary parts with smaller and meaning-full goal directed statements according to main topic of manuscript

A: The maximum effort has been made to correct the manuscript based on your suggestion. A new introduction has been written.

-plz review the introduction part as whole and replace too long unnecessary parts with smaller and meaning-full, goal directed statements according to main topic of manuscript.

A: The entire introduction was rewritten and highlighted as yellow.

-at the end of study the main idea of manuscript should me pointed

A: It has been mentioned in OBJECTIVE.

-objective and methods should be explained exactly with details. plz consult with an Statistics specialist.

A: They have been corrected based on your suggestions.

-why just this group? because HI has multifactorial etiology (infectons,ottitis media, norological and genetic base , ...) cochlear implant is effective just for minority of this population.so this population may not reflect general HI population characteristics.
plz point this limitation in limitation/conclusion part of manuscript.

A: It has been considered.

-the text should be reviewed by a naive English.

A: it has been corrected.

-correct the statement as a true academic terms.

A: it has been corrected.

-plz review the introduction part as whole and replace too long unnecessary parts with smaller and meaning-full, goal directed statements according to main topic of manuscript.

A: The entire introduction was rewritten and highlighted as yellow.

-what means?
explain with measurable and understandable tools

A: it has been corrected.

-what is the reason for this criteria in a cross sectional study?

A: it has been corrected.

-because the participants were just ones that had cochlear implant surgery(NOT ALL HI patients) this should be pointed in Title and all other parts of manuscript.

A: it has been corrected.

-unnecessary repetition

A: like above (PS), the mentioned statement was related to our result, not the cut off or the analytic process.

-unnecessary repetition

A: like above (PS), the mentioned statement was related to our result, not the cut off or the analytic process.

-this statement is different from main title of manuscript. plz correct it

A: it has been corrected.

- because the population in this study are patients of CI(NOT HI) the results should be compared with similar populationC(NOT ALL HI)

A: First, a general comparison has been implemented. Then, based on your suggestion, the comparisons have been specialized, only the population with the CI history.

-this statement is in opposite of introduction part. explain exactly

A: it has been corrected.

-as explained above, some contrary results are related to basically different methods an population(as pointed in references 30-38). plz review this segments and insert more similar studies.

A: Your suggestions have been corrected to the greatest extent.

-what means exactly?

A: it has been deleted.

-this section is not related to title. replace it with more relevant topics

A: it has been deleted.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 12 Nov 2023 – 12 Nov 2023

Reza Tavakolizadeh Reviewer

ACCEPT 12 Nov 2023

The changes that were previously requested have been made.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 12 Nov 2023

Dear EIC,
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, there is still room for further improvement, which the authors should consider.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 12 Nov 2023

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it carefully based on the reviewers' and AE's comments.

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.

Reply to Reviewers (141029)

The Evaluation of Parental Stress and the Quality of Life among Iranian Parents of Hearing Impaired Children with Cochlear Implantation History: A Cross-Sectional and Descriptive-Correlational Study

Dear EIC

I would like to appreciate you for spending your valuable time in reviewing our manuscript for the second time (ID 141029). Based on your reviewers' valuable comments, the manuscript has been changed. Still, we are ready for any potential further changes.

kind regards

Reviewer 1:

dear authors.
thanks for your efforts on revision the manuscript. there are some recommendations:

1_background part is too long and contains unnecessary explanations. plz revise it with more relevant, clear and short ones.
A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion. Backgrounds have been revised based on your comment to the greatest extent.

2_there are many repetitions in statements and words that should be revised.
A. It has been considered and corrected.

3_inclusion and exclusion criteria should be indicated clearly without any confusing unnecessary terms.
A. They have been revised.

4_ other recommendations pointed in text
A. All of your valuable comments have been considered and corrected precisely. (Revisions related to the PDF are in PAGE 6)

Reviewer 2:

The changes that were previously requested have been done.

A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion.

Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC,
The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated. However, still there are a few rooms for further improvement which the authors should consider.
A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion. We have considered all of your reviewer's valuable comments precisely.

EIC Decision:

Dear Author,
Your manuscript still needs some revision. Please revise it based on Reviewers and AE comments accurately.
A. Great thanks for your valuable opinion. We have considered all of your reviewer's valuable comments precisely.

PDF:

1- the introduction part contains so many unnecessary descriptions(QOL,stress,...). this descriptions for some meaningful terms NOT necessary. plz revise introduction part in small,relevant and meaningful type that contain main parts according to the topic:
1_what is the topic
2_what we know
3_what we dont know
4_what we want to know

A: The greatest appreciation for spending your valuable time.
Based on your recommendations:
We summarized the background, instead, we used more relevant statements.
Unfortunately, we couldn't totally remove our definition about the PS and QOL, as they are the main keywords of our research. However, we summarized them to just one single fluent sentence.
Undoubtedly, what you mentioned is totally correct. But, in order to maintain the fluency and articulation of the paragraph, we just paraphrased them. So, it is requested with the greatest respect that let us keep this part. Still, if keeping this part is not possible, we are totally ready to obey what you order.
Some of key concepts and statements of the BACKGROUND have been replaced, due to improve the fluency.
ALL OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED PHRASES HAVE BEEN HIGHLIGHTED IN MANUSCRIPT.

2-there are too unnecessary ,not evidence based suggestions in objective section. plz explain the objective part more clearly according to the main topic

A: Totally considered and fully revised.

3- what means this part clearly?

A: Totally considered and fully changed (HIGHLIGHTED).

4- this part is repeated in previous paragraph

A: Updated and added to previous paragraph (HIGHLIGHTED).

5- please insert inclusion criteria clearly and without any more unnecessary terms. this part is confusing

A: Whole INC. & EXC. criteria were revised fluently based on your comment (HIGHLIGHTED).

6- ?????

the text should be revised by a native ENGLISH
A: Updated (HIGHLIGHTED).

7- ????
A: Updated (HIGHLIGHTED).

8- what was the reason for interview ? the sf-36 does not need interview.
A: Greatest appreciation for your comment. It was changed.

9- the details of demographic questioner is not needed. these parts are pointed in tables
A: The demographic details were removed.
10-these parts are rules in all clinical researches and doesnt need to explain.
A: Greatest appreciation for your valuable point of view. Undoubtedly, what you mentioned is totally correct. But, in order to maintain the fluency and articulation of the paragraph, we just paraphrased that. So, it is requested with the greatest respect that let us keep this part. Still, if keeping this part is not possible, we are totally ready to obey what you order.

11-???
A: Changed.

12- we should not repeat results in discussion part as same.
A: All repeated statistical information were removed from DISCUSSION.

13- this study is about CI patients not HI ones. correct statements.
A: Undoubtedly, what you mentioned is totally correct. Here we wanted to indicate that "the usual limitation and consequences of hearing impaired children on their parents was not true about our participants, because they have CI history, besides other reasons that discussed in discussion". In fact, the proposed sentence is an explanation for the previous sentence and an introduction to state the reasons for the differences that will be discussed in the continuation of the discussion. However, we did our best to revise it more fluently based on your recommendation. Still, we are ready for any more potential necessary revisions.

14-"improves" instead
A: Greatest apologies for utilizing the confusing phrases. Here we wanted to indicate that "the following CI, LIMITATIONS were diminished (that is, the abilities were improved)". Undoubtedly, CI cannot improve the limitations! Still, based on your valuable comment, we have corrected the phrases to "abilities are improved".

15- what means?
A: The sentence was paraphrased.

16-unnecessary repeat of results
A: All repeated statistical information were removed from DISCUSSION.

17-?????
A: Revised.

18- "similar" is recommended.
A: It has been obeyed and corrected.

19- unnecessary repeat
A: All repeated statistical information were removed from DISCUSSION.

20- this word has been repeated too many in the text. plz insert other similar words in this statements and other parts, instead.
A: It has been replaced by other words (HIGHLIGHTED).

Dear EIC:
First, I would like to appreciate you and your colleagues for spending your valuable time in reviewing the manuscript for the second time. All of your valuable comments and recommendations were considered and corrected carefully. Undoubtedly, being in the process of reviewing of your journal and benefiting from your knowledge and experiences is the greatest honor for us.
Below are some updated details related to the acknowledgements and funding of current study. We will be extremely grateful if you issue the permission for updating them. Based on the number and date of the contract (no: 1401/5931), it is related to the date before submitting this article in your journal. Therefore, this is not a new contract and it was only missed due to disruption of the Individual and administrative process for which we sincerely apologize.
Besides, we will implement the following details in the online re-submitting process of your website.

Sincerely yours

Acknowledgements & Funding update:
This study is related to the project (no: 1401/5931) from the student research committee, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Science (SBMU), Tehran, Iran. We also appreciate the student research committee and research and technology chancellor of SBMU for the financial support of this study.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 23 Nov 2023 – 24 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 23 Nov 2023

Dear authors
Most of my concerns were addressed properly. In my opinion, the revised paper was good enough to be accepted for publication.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 24 Nov 2023

Dear EIC,
I reviewed the manuscript again. The great effort in improving the manuscript is highly appreciated.
The authors have addressed all comments.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 Nov 2023

Dear authors.
Thanks for your valuable efforts in carefully revising the manuscript.