Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 2 · e139899

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Effect of Implementing Nursing Care Based on Gordon's Model on the Clinical Outcomes of Patients Undergoing Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery: A Quasi-experimental Study

Iman Davarpanah, Mohamad Adine, Nasrin Elahi, Mohammad Hosein Haghighizadeh, Fatemeh Javaherforooshzadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
21 Aug 2023	27 Nov 2023	5 Dec 2023	10.5812/jjcdc-139899

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, 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** Referee 1, Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

2 comments · 5 Oct 2023 – 7 Oct 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 5 Oct 2023

Dear Author, Thank you for submitting your article to the Journal of Chronic Disease Care.
Please address the following points in the article:
1- Prepare the article according to the journal's format.
2- Select keywords based on MeSH.
3- In the introduction, identify patients' problems based on the results of studies conducted in Iran, and identify the challenge addressed by the study on that basis.
4- Provide more explanation of Gordon's model and the nurse's role in this model.
5- Remove the statistical formula and report only statistical parameters such as power, dropout percentage, and alpha and beta values.
6- Present the educational sessions in a table and specify what was taught in each session.
7- How was the instrument scored? Provide an interpretation of the scores.
8- A clinical trial registration code is provided in the ethical considerations section, but the study is described as quasi-experimental in the methods section. Clearly specify the study design and explain the methods according to that design.
9- State the study limitations and provide recommendations for future studies based on these limitations.
10- If the study design is a clinical trial, include a CONSORT flow diagram.
11- Include table footnotes specifying the type of statistical test and statistical significance.
12- Cite articles published in this journal.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 7 Oct 2023

Dear author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions in all parts. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit it as soon as possible.
With best regards.

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.

1. The article should be prepared according to the journal's format: Done.

2. Keywords should be selected based on MeSH: Done.

3. In the Introduction, the problems of the patients should be identified based on the results of studies conducted in Iran

Based on that, the challenge of the study should be identified: No study on the Gordon model has been conducted in Iran on cardiac surgery patients; however, an attempt has been made to present similar studies.

4. The Gordon model and the role of the nurse in this model should be explained further: The Gordon model has been explained, and the role of the nurses in this study was learning the model through training sessions and implementing it precisely on the patients of the intervention group.

5. The statistical formula should be removed, and only statistical indices such as power, dropout rate, and alpha and beta values should be written: Corrected

6. The training sessions should be presented in a table, and it should be specified what items were taught in each session: The training sessions and their content have now been presented in a separate table.

7. What was the scoring method of the instrument? The interpretation of the scores should be written: The scores were in the form of yes and no answers; in the researcher-made checklist, 5 questions (each question examined one outcome) were answered as yes or no at the end of care.

8. In the Ethical Considerations section, a clinical trial registration code is written, but in the Methods, the type of study is stated as quasi-experimental: When the thesis was being written, a code was assigned to the project, but the project is quasi-experimental because randomization was not possible. We have now removed the code, and the study is quasi-experimental. Because the control group was first sampled completely and then

the Gordon model was taught to the nurses, and the intervention group was cared for according to the Gordon model, randomization and simultaneous sampling of the groups were not possible, since the caregivers of both groups were the same, and if we had placed patients in the two groups simultaneously, the Gordon pattern might have been unconsciously implemented by the nurses for the control group as well.

9. The method should be specified clearly, and the method should be explained based on the design: The method has been corrected and explained again.

10. The limitations of the study should be mentioned, and suggestions for future studies should be written based on the limitations: Done

11. If the study design is a clinical trial, a CONSORT diagram should be presented: The study is quasi-experimental.

12. The table footnotes should state the type of statistical test and significance: Done.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 25 Nov 2023 – 26 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Nov 2023

Dear Author, thank you for submitting your article to this journal. Please make the following corrections:
In the tables, periods should be used instead of slashes.
Remove the unrelated letters next to gender.
How was the instrument scored? How were the scores interpreted?

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 25 Nov 2023

Dear Editor,
According to the reviewer, the manuscript requires editing.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 26 Nov 2023

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

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

In the tables, a point should be used instead of a slash: Done.

The irrelevant letters next to sex should be removed: Removed.

What was the scoring method of the instrument? How were the scores interpreted?

Regarding the outcomes of length of ICU stay and duration of connection to the ventilator, the groups were compared with each other based on time, and the mean times were compared between the two groups using the independent t-test. Regarding the other three outcomes, namely successful weaning from the ventilator, ICU readmission, and mortality, the results were recorded as yes/no for each patient, and finally the percentages of yes and no answers for each outcome were compared between the groups using the chi-square test and Fisher's exact test.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 5 Dec 2023 – 5 Dec 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 5 Dec 2023

Dear Editor,
All requested corrections have been made by the author. The article is approved.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 5 Dec 2023

Dear Editor-in-Chief,
The article is approved.