Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 11 · Issue 1 · e120534

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Relationship Between Coping Styles and Blood Pressure in the Staff of Covid-19 Wards of Hospitals of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences During 2020 - 2021

Saeed Jameshorani, Keivan Kakabraee, Karim Afsharinia, Saeedeh Alsadat Hosseini

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Oct 2021	5 Jan 2022	16 Jan 2022	10.5812/jcrps.120534

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, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Aalireza Khatoony, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 11
3 **Revision 2** Aalireza Khatoony, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 14
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 15
Authors' reply to reviewers 16
Reviewer and editor comments 17

1 Original submission

3 comments · 30 Nov 2021 – 5 Dec 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 30 Nov 2021

Introduction:
The introduction does not have a proper structure. The first paragraph is about the complications of COVID in patients, while the present study is about health care providers.
The importance and necessity of the study are not well stated.
Methods:
The reason for choosing the age range of 30 to 60 years should be stated with a reference. The researcher is not allowed to limit sampling without a scientific reason.
Why is demographic information limited to a few characteristics?
Who was the target population? How many were doctors, and how many were nurses? The Cochrane calculation is based on a population of a certain size, and it seems unlikely that applying the Cochran formula to the study population in the three hospitals would yield the sample size used in the present study.
What sampling method was used to select participants from the study population? What percentage were doctors, and what percentage were nurses? What was the reason for these proportions? Please explain.
Define full shift in the Methods section based on a scientific reference. What is meant by full shift?
The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not properly defined. Failure to complete the questionnaire is a study limitation, not an exclusion criterion. Why are people undergoing psychiatric treatment included in the inclusion criteria? Please explain.
The ethics code and sampling permit are not specified. The design code and sampling permit are attached to the response to the reviewers.
The questionnaire used is in English. Has it undergone psychometric assessment in Iran? If it has, this should be stated in the Methods section. Otherwise, it should first have been translated and back-translated by the researcher, and its validity and reliability should have been reestablished for use in the present study population.
findings:
On what criteria was age divided into three groups? Please provide a reference.
The inclusion criteria stated that the age range was 30 to 60 years, but about 54% of the participants were 25 to 35 years old in the results. Why?
Table 2 is drawn from right to left.
The study population consisted of physicians and nurses, but the results are limited to nurses. Why?
Discussion:
The discussion is very weak and limited to a few results. There is no scientific discussion; only some results of the present study and a limited number of results from other studies are stated.
Conclusion:
The conclusions are not based on the findings and go beyond the findings of this study. They should be expressed based on the study findings.
reference:
The number of references used in the discussion is limited and needs to be revised, with a detailed discussion of the number of references used.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 5 Dec 2021

Major Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 5 Dec 2021

Major 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.

With greetings and respect

The respected reviewers' corrections were made and marked .with yellow highlighting in the article

:Response to the first reviewer's corrections

It is suggested that the Methods section be written (1 according to the following style: study design, samples and sampling method, study instrument, data collection method, data analysis method, ethical considerations

.Corrected

Wherever a percentage is mentioned, the corresponding (2 simple frequency should also be given in parentheses, and vice versa

.Calculated and corrected

Throughout the article, numbers should be expressed to one (3 .decimal place

.Corrected throughout the article

In the Discussion section, the author needs to present their (4 own analysis of the comparison of their results with those of .others

Analysis was added to parts of the Discussion for better .coherence and summarization

At the end of the article, the sections on the application of (5 the study and recommendations should be included within the .conclusion section

.Added in accordance with the respected reviewer's comment

.In terms of the English language, editing is needed (6

.Reviewed and re-edited

:Response to the second reviewer's corrections

.The Introduction does not have an appropriate structure (1

.Rewritten and corrected

What is the reason for choosing the age range of 30 to 60 (2 ?years

According to the reviews conducted, the age range of the active working staff (working physicians and nurses) in the studied centers is mainly 30-60 years, and this age range did .not impose any restriction on the study participants

Why is the demographic information limited to a small (3 ?number

Initially, the inclusion and exclusion criteria were checked for each participant (working physicians and nurses) (the inclusion criteria included declaring willingness to participate in the study, a minimum age of 30 and a maximum age of 60 years, not being under treatment for a psychological illness and not using psychological medications, and the absence of psychological events such as divorce, death of loved ones, etc. in the past three months), and it should be noted that presence for at least 3 months in full shifts in the COVID-19 ward is one of the main conditions for entering the study; after the necessary checks, the staff (working physicians and nurses) .who were willing to participate in the study were enrolled

?Who was the target population (4

The study population consists of physicians and nurses working in the COVID-19 wards of Golestan, Farabi, and Imam Reza (AS) hospitals during the years 1399-1400, with presence for at least 3 months in full shifts in the COVID-19 ward

?How many were physicians and how many were nurses (5

nurses (57.14%) and 450 physicians (42.85%) 600

The Cochran calculation is based on a known population (6 size, and it seems unlikely that the number of individuals in three hospitals would be limited to the number calculated with ?Cochran's formula

The staff (working physicians and nurses) were collected from three COVID-19-affiliated medical centers (Golestan, Farabi, and Imam Reza (AS)), and given that the Cochran formula is for a known population size, about 1050 personnel (working physicians and nurses) were available, for whom, based on the Cochran sample size, 278 samples should have been examined. I must respectfully state that, given the limitations and the inclusion and exclusion criteria, which are among the main conditions of the study (presence for at least 3 months in full shifts in the COVID-19 ward, and inclusion criteria including declaring willingness to participate in the study, a minimum age of 30 and a maximum age of 60 years, not being under treatment for a psychological illness and not using psychological medications, and the absence of psychological events such as divorce, death of loved ones, etc. in the past three months), in order to increase the accuracy of the study, an effort was made to examine a larger number of samples who met the appropriate study conditions and consented to .participate in the study

?What is the definition of a full shift (7

Personnel shifts in medical centers consist of morning, evening, and night shifts, and work shifts, as an intervening variable, affect the mental health and quality of performance of personnel. Therefore, a full shift in this study means the morning shift, and at the end of the morning shift, over three consecutive shifts, the personnel's blood pressure was measured.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria are not properly (8
defined; non-completion of the questionnaire is a limitation, not a criterion. Why are individuals under psychiatric treatment included in the inclusion criteria?

In the present study, non-completion of the questionnaires is taken to indicate a lack of informed consent to participate in the study; for this reason, it was considered an exclusion criterion.

Regarding being under psychiatric treatment, I respectfully state that this was due to a typographical error: instead of "not being under treatment for a psychological illness", the phrase "being under treatment for a psychological illness" was written, which has been corrected.

The ethical regulations and the sampling permit are not (9
specified

Stated in the Materials and Methods section.

Regarding the questionnaire being in English, and the (10
psychometric analysis or the assessment of the validity and reliability of the translated version, if the questionnaire was translated by the author?

The questionnaire was the Lazarus-Folkman Ways of Coping Questionnaire, which measures eight coping strategies (seeking social support, accepting responsibility, planful problem solving, reappraisal of the problem, confrontation, distancing, avoidance, and self-control). The questionnaire consists of 66 items, which were scored on a Likert scale from

0 to 3 (I do not use it = 0, I use it to some extent = 1, I use it most of the time = 2, I use it a lot = 3). The internal consistency of the scale was calculated by Lazarus in 1993 as between 66% and 79%. In many studies, the translated version of the Lazarus-Folkman questionnaire has been confirmed in terms of psychometrics and the determination of Cronbach's alpha. In the study by Amirmasoud Rostami, the above questionnaire was also examined and used for the findings, and after confirmation, the overall Cronbach's alpha of the test .() was reported as 0.87

Rostami A M, Ahadi H, Cheraghaligol H. The Prediction of Coping Strategies Based on PersonalityTraits in Irritants Affiliates. etiadpajohi. 2013; 7 (26) :111-126URL: http://etiadpajohi.ir/article-1-291-fa.html

Also, Zarei et al. in 1390 examined the above questionnaire in their research, and a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.82 was .reported

Zarei Salman, Asadi Zahra. Comparison of personality traits and stress coping styles in addicted and normal adolescents. .Research on Addiction, 20, 87-104

On what criterion was age divided into three groups? The (11 inclusion criterion was 30 to 60 years, but 54% aged 25 to 35 .years is presented in the results

Thank you for the respected reviewer's comment. The age range, as stated in all sections of the study, is 30-60 years, which should be corrected in the above table; the problem was .in the back-translation and translation

.Table 2 is drawn from right to left (12

.The table was rewritten and corrected

The study population is physicians and nurses; why are the (13 ?results limited to nurses

The results for both groups, physicians and nurses, were .stated and discussed

.The Discussion is weak (14

Rewritten and corrected in accordance with the respected .reviewer's comment

The conclusion goes beyond the findings and is not based (15 ?on the findings; it should be corrected

.The results were rewritten and corrected again

The number of references is small and limited, which (16 ?should be revised

.The number of references was revised and matched

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 12 Dec 2021 – 21 Dec 2021

Aalireza Khatoony Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 12 Dec 2021

Dear Dr. Sohrabi
Esteemed Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Greetings,
I would like to inform you that the author has made most of the revisions requested by the reviewers, but these are described only in the response letter and need to be incorporated into the manuscript.
Please address the following points in the revised version.
1. State the study questions at the end of the Introduction.
2. The Methods section should be organized coherently and include the following items in this order: Study design; sample and sampling method (including the study population, sample size calculation method, sampling method, and inclusion and exclusion criteria); study instruments (names of the instruments, including the personal information form and the sphygmomanometer—specify its model and country of manufacture; methods for determining validity and reliability; scoring method); data collection method; data analysis method; ethical considerations (ethics code and type of consent obtained from the participants).
Discussion section:
1. State the study limitations at the end of the Discussion.
2. For each finding for which the results of previous studies are cited, also provide the author's analysis at the end.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 21 Dec 2021

Major Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 21 Dec 2021

Major Revision

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.

The authors did not provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments in this round.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 29 Dec 2021 – 31 Dec 2021

Aalireza Khatoony Reviewer — ACCEPT — 29 Dec 2021

Hello
This is to confirm that the respected author has made the necessary revisions.

Associate Editor — MINOR REVISION — 31 Dec 2021

Minor revision

Editor-in-Chief — MINOR REVISION — 31 Dec 2021

Minor revision

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.

With greetings and respect

All the corrections stated by the respected reviewer were made in the form of comments (question and answer) and .stated in the text of the article

Thank you for your efforts

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 16 Jan 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Jan 2022

Accept