Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Volume 14 · Issue 1 · e153793

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Impact of WhatsApp-Based Self-Care Education on Self-Care Behaviors and Lifestyle in Overweight and Obese Pregnant Women with Diabetes: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Fatemeh Salarkarimi, Majid Karandish, Mehrnoosh Zakerkish, Zahra Abbaspoor

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 Aug 2024	8 Oct 2024	10 Oct 2024	10.5812/jjcdc-153793

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, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

4 comments · 3 Sep 2024 – 18 Sep 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 3 Sep 2024

Dear Author, your manuscript entitled " The effect of self-care education delivered via WhatsApp on self-care behaviors and lifestyle among overweight and obese pregnant women with diabetes " has now been assessed. Your manuscript needs to be corrected to allow for a definitive discussion of it. The following comments are suggested to improve the quality of this manuscript.

Abstract:

 The abstract should be more concise. Consider summarizing the key findings in fewer words.

 Highlight the most significant results more clearly. The statistical significance should be emphasized to illustrate the impact of the intervention.

 Ensure that the keywords are relevant and cover major themes of the study.

 "Self-care education for overweight and obese pregnant women with diabetes can help them make the best care and decisions during pregnancy." Consider revising to "Self-care education for overweight and obese pregnant women with diabetes can help them make informed decisions during pregnancy."

Introduction:

 Expand on the background literature regarding the prevalence and implications of gestational diabetes. More recent studies should be included to provide a comprehensive overview.

 Clearly state the gap in existing research that this study aims to fill. This will strengthen the rationale for the study.

 Explicitly state the hypothesis or research question at the end of the introduction to guide the reader.

 "GDM is associated with maternal and fetal complications." Consider specifying what GDM stands for at its first mention.

Methods:

 Provide a clearer explanation of how the sample size was determined, including the rationale for the dropout rate.

 Describe the randomization method in more detail to ensure reproducibility.

 Include more information on the validity and reliability of the instruments used for data collection.

 "This study recruited overweight and obese pregnant women with gestational diabetes from healthcare centers in the eastern and western regions of Ahvaz, Iran." This sentence could be simplified for clarity.

Results:

 Use tables or figures to present key findings more effectively. For instance, showing changes in blood glucose levels before and after the intervention in a table would enhance clarity.

 Provide more details about the statistical methods used, including any adjustments made for potential confounders.

 "The mean ± standard deviation of one-hour postprandial blood glucose levels was significantly different..." should be "The mean ± standard deviation of one-hour postprandial blood glucose levels was significantly different..."

 Ensure that all tables include legends where necessary to explain the data presented.

 Maintain consistency in the format of tables, particularly in terms of decimal places and statistical notation.

 Review the manuscript for consistent use of terms (e.g., "WhatsApp" vs. "Whatsapp") and ensure that all abbreviations are defined upon first use.

 Check for subject-verb agreement and proper tense usage throughout the manuscript.

Discussion:
 Discuss the implications of the findings in the context of existing literature. How do these results compare to previous studies?
 Clearly state the limitations of the study and how they might affect the results. This is crucial for transparency.
 Suggest areas for future research based on the findings and limitations of the current study.
 "Given the critical role of self-care in managing gestational diabetes and the limited research on the efficacy of online education in this context..." Consider restructuring for clarity, such as "Considering the critical role of self-care in managing gestational diabetes and the limited research on the efficacy of online education, this study..."

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Sep 2024

Thanks for referring the article to me for review. My general opinion is as follows:
- This article is not innovative and also requires major revision in novelty and background, methods, analysis and discussion. (main comments)

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 17 Sep 2024

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

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 18 Sep 2024

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

Reviewer Comments	Author's Response	Changes Made
General	**Reviewer 1**: Article lacked novelty and required major revisions in background, methods, analysis, and discussion. (Green color)	We appreciated your feedback and revised the manuscript to improve novelty. We added more recent research to strengthen the background, methods, analysis, and discussion sections. We also expanded the literature review to clarify the research gap and provided a more robust discussion.
Abstract	**Reviewer 2**: The abstract needed to be more concise, with clearer presentation of key findings and statistical significance. Keywords needed to be relevant. (Red color)	We revised the abstract to make it more concise and to highlight the most significant findings, including statistical significance. Keywords were reviewed and updated for relevance.
Introduction	**Reviewer 2**: The background on gestational diabetes needed to be expanded with recent studies. The research gap and hypothesis were not clearly stated.	We expanded the introduction to include more recent studies on gestational diabetes. The research gap was clarified, and the hypothesis was explicitly stated at the end of the introduction.
	Reviewer 2: GDM needed to be defined at its first mention.	We ensured that GDM was defined at its first mention.
Methods	**Reviewer 2**: The sample size determination, randomization method, and validity of instruments used for data collection were unclear. The recruitment sentence needed simplification.	We revised the methods section to provide more detail on the sample size calculation, randomization method, and the validity of the instruments. The recruitment sentence was simplified for clarity.
Results	**Reviewer 2**: Key findings needed to be presented more effectively using tables/figures. More statistical details were required. Table formatting and language consistency needed attention.	We improved the presentation of key findings by including tables and figures, provided additional statistical details, ensured consistency in table formatting, and reviewed the manuscript for grammatical accuracy and consistent terminology.
Discussion	**Reviewer 2**: The discussion needed to compare findings with existing literature, state limitations, and suggest future research areas.	We expanded the discussion section to compare our findings with existing literature, clearly stated the limitations, and proposed areas for future research.
Language & Formatting	**Reviewer 2**: The manuscript needed to be reviewed for subject-verb agreement, tense usage, and consistency in terminology (e.g., "WhatsApp"	We carefully reviewed the manuscript for consistent terminology and grammatical accuracy.

	vs. "Whatsapp").	

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 10 Oct 2024

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 10 Oct 2024

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising your manuscript based on the reviewer's comments. This version of the manuscript is acceptable for publication. Please correct the CONSORT flow chart based on the 2020 version. You can fix it in the proof stage of publication.
Thank you