Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 12 · Issue 4 · e138098

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Caregiver Burden and Quality of Life among Caregivers of Cancer Patients in Ahvaz, 2021 - 2022: A Cross-Sectional Study

Mansooreh Rooeintan, Shayesteh Haghighi, Mehrnaz Ahmadi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
7 Jun 2023	26 Sep 2023	1 Oct 2023	10.5812/jjcdc-138098

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** Associate Editor, Hadis Ashrafizadeh, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 17

1 Original submission

4 comments · 10 Jun 2023 – 14 Jul 2023

Associate Editor

REJECT 10 Jun 2023

Dear author

I regret to inform you that your manuscript did not receive a passing score on our priority criteria.

The editorial team appreciates your interest in JJCDC and hopes we will receive your research articles in the future.
Editorial Office of JJCDC.

Hadis Ashrafizadeh Reviewer

REJECT 15 Jun 2023

Hello dear authors,
I am very happy to have been given the opportunity to review this article. Currently, the research conducted on informal caregivers is of high value; however, the relationship between these two variables has been repeatedly studied in Iran and other countries.
The descriptive-analytic nature of the work allows it to be redone, but not until consensus is reached. More than half of the studies conducted in this field show that as the burden and pressure of care increase, the quality of life worsens. Therefore, I do not see innovation in this work because it does not add new knowledge, and I do not consider this study suitable for publication in this journal. However, I leave the final decision to the editor.
Some examples of similar studies are given below.
(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31872293/
https://ijcbnm.sums.ac.ir/article_44888_b920d2e47578fba3cc298b3b77f587e6.pdf
http://rph.khu.ac.ir/article-1-3152-fa.html
DOI: 10.4103/ijc.IJC_671_19)
In order to improve the research, the following are the things that researchers should pay attention to.
1- The cross-sectional nature (analytical description) of the study, as well as its time and place, should be presented in the title.
2- In the keywords, include the words cancer and caregivers.
3- In the abstract findings, report the significant p-values for the correlation tests.
4- It is better to mention the concept of quality of life in a paragraph and then explain its relationship with care burden or care pressure.
5- In the introduction, you mentioned several studies showing that a high burden of care reduces the quality of life. Where, then, is the research gap that calls for a new study?
6- Mention the sampling method in the methods section.
7- What are the validity and reliability of the tools for the community of cancer patients? Only the validity of the original version is mentioned.
8- Why is the quality of life not reported as low, medium, and high?
9- The findings are too long and should be shortened. In addition, present most of the data in tables and figures.
10- Cite more studies in the discussion. Only one study is presented to compare the average burden of care. Is it enough for the discussion?
11- Why is the average quality of life of patients not discussed?

12- Considering that many studies have been done in this field, more studies can be used to enrich the discussion.
13- I suggest that, considering that the main purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between quality of life and care burden, you should focus more on this relationship and justify it.
However, the main discussion is about the relationship between care burden and demographic and clinical factors. If this is your goal, you should modify the title and say, "Determining the care burden of caregivers with cancer patients and related factors."
14- Modify the format of the tables and figures according to the guidelines. Why are capital letters used in Table 1?

With respect

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 14 Jul 2023

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs some revision in all sections. Please revise and resubmit.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 14 Jul 2023

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, you should revise your manuscript and resubmit.
Thank you

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.

In the name of God

Dear editor in Chief of the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Greeting and regards

We are grateful to the reviewers for providing valuable comments to enrich the content of this article. The comments of dear reviewers of the article have answered below.

Comment of reviewer: "More than half of the studies conducted in this field show that as the burden and pressure of care increase, the quality of life worsens. Therefore, I do not see innovation in this work. Because it does not add new knowledge."

Response: According to studies, the cancer pain and subsequent psychological stress, which affects the patient and his/her caregivers, are different depending on the geographical, ethnic and religious conditions. Therefore, it is very important to conduct population-specific research in this regard. However, there have been few relevant studies in Iran. In addition, according to previous studies, general instruments have often used to evaluate QOL of family caregivers of cancer patients, however, in this study a specific instrument (CQOLC) used for evaluate QOL of family caregivers of cancer patients. These points mentioned in last paragraph of article and highlighted with yellow color. In addition, in this study, only the relationship between quality of life and caregiving burden has not discussed. Rather, the demographic and clinical factors influencing each one have mentioned and the models has presented in this regard. In some cases, contradictory findings with previous studies or new findings compared to previous studies have obtained, which mentioned in detail in the discussion section. These findings can significantly contribute to the development of knowledge in this field.

Comment of reviewer:" The cross-sectional nature (analytical description) of the study of time and place should be presented in the title".

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" In the keywords, mention the words' cancer and caregivers."

Response: The word "caregivers" added to the keywords section and shown in yellow color, but instead of the word "cancer" the word "neoplasm" was used according to the mesh.

Comment of reviewer:" In the abstract findings, mention the significant values of the p-value for correlation tests."

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" It is better to mention the concept of quality of life in a paragraph and then explain its relationship with care burden or care pressure."

Response: Considering that in the introduction, the concepts should expressed from the whole to the parts; in the beginning, it has discussed about the care burden of caregivers. Then it was be stated that the increase in care burden could reduce the quality of life of caregivers and after that, it discussed about the quality of life and the consequences of its reduction. In most of the related articles, this arrangement has taken into consideration in the presentation of the contents. However, if the dear reviewer's opinion is still on changing the order of these materials, this order will changed.

Comment of reviewer:" In the introduction of several studies, you mentioned that a high burden of care reduces the quality of life, then where is the research gap that calls for a new study?"

Response: In this regard, the necessary explanations provided at the beginning.

Comment of reviewer:" Mention the sampling method in the method."

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" What is the validity and reliability of the tools for the community of cancer patients only the validity of the original version is mentioned?"

Response: In addition to mentioning the validity and reliability of the tools in the original version, the validity and reliability of this tool in the Iranian caregivers population is also mentioned (references 22 and 24). Reference 24 is about caregivers of cancer patients.

Comment of reviewer:" Why is the quality of life not reported as low, medium and high?"

Response: The possible score of this questioner range is 0-140. A lower score indicates a better QOL in most questions of this questionnaire. However, the scoring in questions 34, 28, 27, 22, 4, 10, 12, 16 are reversed and a higher score indicates a better QOL. This method of scoring has mentioned in the original version of this tool and previous studies. It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" The findings are too long and should be shortened. In addition, present most of the data in tables and figures."

Response: Please state which part of the findings should remove to done. Currently, most of the data been presented in tables and there are no duplicates data in the text of the article.

Comment of reviewer:" Cite more studies in the discussion. Only one study presented to compare the average burden of care. Is it enough for the discussion?"

Response: In this regard, the results of three related studies have discussed and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" Why is the average quality of life of patients not discussed?"

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" Considering that many studies have been done in this field, more studies can be used to enrich the discussion."

Response: The results of 14 relevant and new articles have used to complete the discussion. However, please, dear reviewer, state which part needs to been completed again so that the necessary information can be added.

Comment of reviewer:" I suggest that considering that the main purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between quality of life and care burden, you should focus more on this relationship and justify it. However, the main discussion is about the relationship between care burden and demographic and clinical factors. If this is your goal, you should modify the title and say, "Determining the care burden of caregivers with cancer patients and related factors."

Response: In most of the previous related articles, the relationship between caregiver burden and quality of life has discussed. Then, the influencing factors on each one have stated and modeling has done in this regard. In this study, this approach used in the discussion section.

Comment of reviewer:" Modify the format of the tables and figures according to the guidelines. Why are capital letters used in Table 1?"

Response: it corrected. In the first table, only the first letter of each phrase written in capital letters.

With best regards

Research team

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 25 Sep 2023 – 25 Sep 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 25 Sep 2023

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript should be revised and resubmitted.
Thank you

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 25 Sep 2023

Dear Author,
Please revise and resubmit.
Thank you

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.

In the name of God

Dear editor in Chief of the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Greeting and regards

We are grateful to the reviewers for providing valuable comments to enrich the content of this article. The comments of dear reviewers of the article have answered below.

Comment of reviewer: "More than half of the studies conducted in this field show that as the burden and pressure of care increase, the quality of life worsens. Therefore, I do not see innovation in this work. Because it does not add new knowledge."

Response: According to studies, the cancer pain and subsequent psychological stress, which affects the patient and his/her caregivers, are different depending on the geographical, ethnic and religious conditions. Therefore, it is very important to conduct population-specific research in this regard. However, there have been few relevant studies in Iran. In addition, according to previous studies, general instruments have often used to evaluate QOL of family caregivers of cancer patients, however, in this study a specific instrument (CQOLC) used for evaluate QOL of family caregivers of cancer patients. These points mentioned in last paragraph of article and highlighted with yellow color. In addition, in this study, only the relationship between quality of life and caregiving burden has not discussed. Rather, the demographic and clinical factors influencing each one have mentioned and the models has presented in this regard. In some cases, contradictory findings with previous studies or new findings compared to previous studies have obtained, which mentioned in detail in the discussion section. These findings can significantly contribute to the development of knowledge in this field.

Comment of reviewer:" The cross-sectional nature (analytical description) of the study of time and place should be presented in the title".

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" In the keywords, mention the words' cancer and caregivers."

Response: The word "caregivers" added to the keywords section and shown in yellow color, but instead of the word "cancer" the word "neoplasm" was used according to the mesh.

Comment of reviewer:" In the abstract findings, mention the significant values of the p-value for correlation tests."

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" It is better to mention the concept of quality of life in a paragraph and then explain its relationship with care burden or care pressure."

Response: Considering that in the introduction, the concepts should expressed from the whole to the parts; in the beginning, it has discussed about the care burden of caregivers. Then it was be stated that the increase in care burden could reduce the quality of life of caregivers and after that, it discussed about the quality of life and the consequences of its reduction. In most of the related articles, this arrangement has taken into consideration in the presentation of the contents. However, if the dear reviewer's opinion is still on changing the order of these materials, this order will changed.

Comment of reviewer:" In the introduction of several studies, you mentioned that a high burden of care reduces the quality of life, then where is the research gap that calls for a new study?"

Response: In this regard, the necessary explanations provided at the beginning.

Comment of reviewer:" Mention the sampling method in the method."

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" What is the validity and reliability of the tools for the community of cancer patients only the validity of the original version is mentioned?"

Response: In addition to mentioning the validity and reliability of the tools in the original version, the validity and reliability of this tool in the Iranian caregivers population is also mentioned (references 22 and 24). Reference 24 is about caregivers of cancer patients.

Comment of reviewer:" Why is the quality of life not reported as low, medium and high?"

Response: The possible score of this questioner range is 0-140. A lower score indicates a better QOL in most questions of this questionnaire. However, the scoring in questions 34, 28, 27, 22, 4, 10, 12, 16 are reversed and a higher score indicates a better QOL. This method of scoring has mentioned in the original version of this tool and previous studies. It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" The findings are too long and should be shortened. In addition, present most of the data in tables and figures."

Response: Please state which part of the findings should remove to done. Currently, most of the data been presented in tables and there are no duplicates data in the text of the article.

Comment of reviewer:" Cite more studies in the discussion. Only one study presented to compare the average burden of care. Is it enough for the discussion?"

Response: In this regard, the results of three related studies have discussed and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" Why is the average quality of life of patients not discussed?"

Response: It mentioned and highlighted with yellow color.

Comment of reviewer:" Considering that many studies have been done in this field, more studies can be used to enrich the discussion."

Response: The results of 14 relevant and new articles have used to complete the discussion. However, please, dear reviewer, state which part needs to been completed again so that the necessary information can be added.

Comment of reviewer:" I suggest that considering that the main purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between quality of life and care burden, you should focus more on this relationship and justify it. However, the main discussion is about the relationship between care burden and demographic and clinical factors. If this is your goal, you should modify the title and say, "Determining the care burden of caregivers with cancer patients and related factors."

Response: In most of the previous related articles, the relationship between caregiver burden and quality of life has discussed. Then, the influencing factors on each one have stated and modeling has done in this regard. In this study, this approach used in the discussion section.

Comment of reviewer:" Modify the format of the tables and figures according to the guidelines. Why are capital letters used in Table 1?"

Response: it corrected. In the first table, only the first letter of each phrase written in capital letters.

With best regards

Research team

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 1 Oct 2023

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 1 Oct 2023

Dear Author,
All comments have been addressed, and this manuscript in its current version is acceptable.
Thank you.