Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 13 · Issue 4 · e145119

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Cancer Family Members' Needs-Based Education in the Management of Anxiety: A Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial

Fatemeh Kianifar, Seyed Mohammad Ebrahim Pourhosseini, Ali Ansari Jaberi, Tayebeh Negahban Bonabi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
20 Jan 2024	21 Apr 2024	29 Apr 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-145119

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, Mehrnaz Ahmadi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Mehrnaz Ahmadi, Editor-in-Chief 4

Authors' reply to reviewers 5

Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

4 comments · 14 Mar 2024 – 9 Apr 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 14 Mar 2024

Dear author;

1- baseline instead of base line

2- Why was “not experiencing adverse events in the past 6 months” considered an inclusion criterion? What do you mean by adverse events? Cancer patients experience many symptoms. It is not clear.

3- You should add a CONSORT diagram.

4- You need to specify exactly what each statistical test is used for.

5- I could not see any information about blinding/masking.

6- You should highlight the significant p-value in the table.

7- Give some suggestions for future studies on the basis of your results.

Mehrnaz Ahmadi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 28 Mar 2024

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This manuscript is valuable but needs correction in various parts.
Abstract
OK
Introduction
1. You need to describe what is known about the issue based on current literature.
2. You need to state what the gap in the literature is and how this study helps to fill the gap in knowledge.
3. On reading the introduction, it seems that the training program is intended to meet caregivers' training needs for patient care, not anxiety management.
Method
1. Give a reference to the article you used to determine the sample size.
2. How did you check this inclusion criterion: “not having a known psychopathy or substance abuse”?
3. The description of the tool has no reference! Who has checked its validity and reliability? You need to provide the reference for the tool and the reference for the article on the psychometric evaluation of the tool.
4. The authors stated that all data were normally distributed. So why are nonparametric tests used? Wilcoxon and Mann-Whitney tests were not used, while they were mentioned in the statistical analysis section.

Results
1. It is better to report the overall results in the text of the manuscript and present the averages in the table.
Discussion
2. There should be an Implications section that draws upon the study findings and specifies what your study has added to nursing science.
3. Write from a nursing perspective and mention nursing frequently throughout the manuscript.
4. State what additional nursing research is needed.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 6 Apr 2024

dear editor
Based on the opinions of respected referees, the article needs to be edited.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Apr 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, your article needs some revisions throughout. Please use previously published related articles in your references. I recommend you revise the manuscript and resubmit it as soon as possible.
With 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.

In the name of God

Dear chief editor of Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care;

Thanks for reviewing the manuscript entitled: "Cancer family member's need-based education in management of anxiety: A randomized controlled clinical trial", and sending valuable comments. Below answered to the comments.

Reviewer 1:

Introduction

1. Need to describe what is known about the issue based on current literature.

The first comment was very general and vague, however, every part needs to be reviewed, please specify exactly so that it can be corrected.

Based on the principle of scientific literature writing, we have mentioned every necessary material in different paragraphs. Including:

- ✓ The first paragraph: Emergence of collaborative care, especially in cancer patients and in the context of modern care.
- ✓ The second paragraph: the necessity of training caregivers of cancer patients.
- ✓ The third paragraph: the challenges that the caregivers of cancer patients related to obtaining the required health information, including fear and anxiety (as the dependent variable of the research(
- ✓ The fourth paragraph: The importance of receiving the required information and avoiding deficiencies and lack of information and information overload
- ✓ The fifth paragraph: the necessity of introducing suitable and efficient strategies for training caregivers of cancer patients and introducing knowledge gaps (limitation of similar studies)

2. Need to state what the gap in the literature is and how this study helps to fill the gap in knowledge.

Based on existing knowledge, informal caregivers either do not receive the information completely which they need, or suffer from information overload, or do not have sufficient motivation to seek and receive the health information they need to care for cancer patients. Therefore, as an important principle of holistic nursing, it is necessary to study and introduce the appropriate strategy for the education of these people in a scientific way. No similar study was found in the literature review.

This study seeks to introduce this efficient and effective strategy.

The above explanations are mentioned in the paragraphs at the end of the introduction.

3. By reading the introduction, it seems that the training program is to meet the training needs of caregivers to care for patients, not anxiety management.

As explained in the third paragraph based on scientific evidence, anxiety is one of the consequences of not receiving information in cancer caregivers.

Method

1. Give a reference to the article you used to determine the sample size.

The similar article referenced.

2. How did you check this inclusion criteria? “not having a known psychopathy or substance abuse".

In the self-report method and based on the question "Do you have a history of mental illness diagnosed by a specialist doctor and receiving related treatment? Do you use addictive substances?"

3. Introducing the tool has no reference! Who has checked the validity and reliability? Need to provide the reference of the tool and the reference of the article on the psychometric evaluation tool.

The explanation and the reference was added in method.

4. The authors stated that all data were normal. So why are non-parametric tests used? Wilcoxon and Mann-Whitney tests were not used, while they were mentioned in the statistical analysis section.

This typo has been corrected.

At the time of writing the proposal, because the data distribution was not clear, we mentioned these tests.

Results

1. It is better to report the overall results in the text of the manuscript and present the averages in the table.

The mean and SD values was deleted from text.

Discussion

2. There should be an Implications section that draws upon the study findings and specify what your study has added to nursing science.

This purpose is mentioned in the conclusion section. Is it necessary to bring it under a separate title?

3. Write from a nursing perspective, mention nursing frequently throughout the manuscript.

Although teaching patients and their caregivers is the duty of the treatment team, including nurses. In this manuscript, nurses and nursing are mentioned many times.

We highlighted the use of the word "nurse" in the text.

4. State what additional nursing research is needed.

We gave recommendations for future research in the last three lines before the conclusion section.

Reviewer 2:

1- baseline instead of base line

Was corrected.

2- why -not experiencing adverse events in the past 6 months- considered as inclusion criteria? what is your mean about adverse events? cancer patients experiencing many symptoms. it is not clear.

The target group was the caregivers of cancer patients and the inclusion criteria were considered for the caregivers, not the patients themselves.

3- you should add a CONSORT diagram.

Consort diagram was also attached at the same time as the manuscript submission. However, we added its image in the text.

4- You need to specify exactly what each statistical test is used for.

Was corrected.

5- I could not see any information about blinding/masking.

6- you should highlight significant p-value in the table.

Changed in highlighted form.

7- give some suggestions for future studies on the basis of your results.

We gave recommendations for future research in the last three lines before the conclusion section.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 25 Apr 2024 – 29 Apr 2024

Mehrnaz Ahmadi Reviewer

ACCEPT 25 Apr 2024

According to the corrections made and the answers given by the authors, my concerns have been largely resolved. Congratulations to the authors.

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 29 Apr 2024

Dear author,
I believe this manuscript in its current format is ready for publication. Thank you for choosing JJCDC for your publication.
With best regards.