Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 3 · e139342

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Relationships Between Perceived Stigma and Coping Strategies in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis

Fariba Abdollahi, Eman Ariyan, Fardin Rastegar, Rana Rezai Sepasi, Seyedeh Ameneh Motalebi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
22 Jul 2023	6 Jan 2024	11 Jan 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-139342

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

1 Original submission

3 comments · 19 Aug 2023 – 7 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 19 Aug 2023

Dear Editor,
The article does not present very strong or practical results.

Associate Editor

REJECT 3 Oct 2023

Unfortunately, your manuscript has been denied publication in JJCDC Care as it is not appropriate for this journal.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2023

Dear Authors;
Thank you for sending your manuscript titled Relationships between Perceived Stigma and Coping Strategies in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis. You should revise your study and resubmit.

1. Please check your keywords against the MeSH database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.
2. The Methods and Results sections of the abstract are poor. There should be more explanation of your findings.
3. Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction and discussion. Delete the questions at the end of the introduction. You should state one aim.
4. The Methods section in JJCDC follows a structure; please see published articles. The study design has not been explained clearly.
5. What was your sample size formula? What was your sampling strategy? Please explain your inclusion and exclusion criteria in detail.
6. The reliability and validity of the measurement tools need to be explained more.
7. Please see published manuscripts and revise your table. You should present frequency (percent) in one column. Why did you not examine the relationships between your demographic characteristics and stigma? These findings are limited, and you should report all relationships. Please use advanced statistics, for example, logistic regression and so on.
8. There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
9. Please mention the limitations and strengths of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.

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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care,

Thank you for your thorough review and consideration of our Manuscript Thank you for your thorough review and consideration of our Manuscript ID 139342 entitled “Relationships between Perceived Stigma and Coping Strategies in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis” which was submitted to the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
We have modified the manuscript based on the reviewer’s comments, and detailed corrections are listed below point by point.

Reviewer 1
1. Please check your Keywords with Mesh data base. It seems that the key words need some revisions

It was checked and corrected.

2. Method and Result of abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings.

The comment was applied and more explanation were added to method and result sections.

3. Please explain more about the novelty of your article in introduction and discussion. delete questions end of introduction. you should bring one aim.

Thank you for the valuable comment. The novelty of the study was added in the last paragraph of introduction. The aim of study was corrected.

4. Method in JJCDC is organized please see published articles. Design of study have not explained clearly.

The published articles were checked and the method section was corrected accordingly. The more explanation about the design of study was added in the method section.

5. What was your sample size formula? What was your sampling strategy; Please explain your inclusion and exclusion criteria in detail.

The sample size formula was inserted in the article. Sampling strategy was explained in the method section. The inclusion and exclusion criteria was explained in detail.

6. The reliability and validity of the measurement tools need to explain more.

More explanation about the reliability and validity of the measurement tools were added.

7. Please see published manuscript and revise your table. you hsould bring ferequesncy(percent) in one column. why didnt relate your demographic with stigma? these findings are limited and you should bring all relations. Please use advanced statistics for example logistic regression and so on.

The tables were corrected based on the journal format. The results of the relationship between the demographic and clinical variables and stigma were inserted in Table 3. As there is not a cut

point for stigma in the SSCI-8 questionnaire, we could not use the logistic regression. Furthermore, the sample size was not enough for using multi regression model.

8. There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

The manuscript was checked and edited by an expert editor.

9. Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study. Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in discussion.

The limitation and strength of study were added. More explanation about the novelty of the study were added in the last paragraph of introduction and discussion.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 11 Dec 2023 – 23 Dec 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 11 Dec 2023

Dear Author, thank you for submitting your manuscript to this journal. Please make the following revisions:
1- Prepare the manuscript according to this journal's structure and format. See the sample articles published in the latest issue.
In the Methods section, fully explain how the instrument scores are interpreted.
Provide the study's full ethics code.
Specify where the study was conducted.
State the study's limitations and provide suggestions for future studies.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 11 Dec 2023

Dear Editor,
The manuscript requires revision based on the comments of one of the reviewers.
Thank you.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 23 Dec 2023

Dear Author,
There are some comments that you should address before resubmitting.
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.

Dear Editor-in-Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care,

Thank you for your thorough review and consideration of our Manuscript Thank you for your thorough review and consideration of our Manuscript ID 139342 entitled “Relationships between Perceived Stigma and Coping Strategies in Patients with Multiple Sclerosis” which was submitted to the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
We have modified the manuscript based on the reviewer’s comments, and detailed corrections are listed below point by point.
Reviewer 1:

Dear author, thank you for submitting the article to this journal; please correct the following items:

- The article should be prepared according to the structure and format of this journal. See sample articles published in the latest issue.

The published sample article was reviewed and checked, and the structure of the present article was corrected on that basis.

In the Methods section, the interpretation of the instrument scores should be fully explained.

The interpretation of the scores was explained.

The questions were scored on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 0 = “does not apply and/or not used” to 3 = “used a great deal.” Higher scores in each subscale indicate greater use of the respective coping strategy (20).

In the SSCI-8, items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always). The total score ranges from 8 to 40, with higher scores indicating higher degree of perceived stigmatization.

- The ethics code of the study should be fully included.

Thanking the respected reviewer, the ethics code was fully included.

- The place where the study was conducted should be mentioned.
  The place of the study was mentioned in the Abstract and Methods.

The limitations of the study and suggestions for future studies should be mentioned

Thanking the respected reviewer, the limitations of the study were mentioned in the Limitations and Strengths section. Suggestions for future studies were added.

.

Reviewer 2:

Comments were applied.

Thank you for your kindness.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 11 Jan 2024

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 11 Jan 2024

Dear Author,
All comments have been revised, and this manuscript is acceptable.
Thank you.