Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Sciences
Volume 10 · Issue 4 · e141576

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Effect of Collaborative Care on Fear of Disease Progression in Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Marzieh Ebrahimi, Ali Ansari Jaberi, Tayebeh Negahban Bonabi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
10 Oct 2023	6 Nov 2023	11 Nov 2023	10.5812/jnms-141576

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 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

1 comment · 22 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 22 Oct 2023

Kindly see the attachment.

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 reviewers, while thanking you for your valuable comments, the following corrections were made in the manuscript.

Add the effect of

The title has been changed.

The type of study should be mentioned in the title

The type of study was added.

The type of study should be mentioned in the method

The type of study was added.

What is the reason for using random minimization method?

In this method, the allocation of samples in the studied groups is carried out by adjusting the effect of some important variables. In this study, the type of MS disease was placed in 4 categories of the minimization table

The complete term must be mentioned at first time.

Was added.

Delete the software

Was deleted.

Mention the descriptive statistics

Was added.

Omit the significant level

Omitted.

The comparison between groups, which is the main purpose of the study, should be mentioned first

Accomplished.

These are adjectives. Where are their noun?

The fear is the name

FOP needs writing correction through the manuscript

It was corrected.

What is the difference between MS and other diseases in which the collaborative care model was implemented and effective, but the results of the reviewed studies cannot be generalized to this disease? To explain the necessity of the study based on the lack or inconsistency of information

Answered.

What were the results of the studies, were there any contradictory studies?

Answered.

Which kind of intervention studies? Clinical trial, semi-excremental or ...?

Was added.

The research community should be mentioned

Was added.

Did you consider any drop out?

The sentence was completed.

How many patients and how many caregivers were in each group?

Was added.

Please report the initial number of participants totally and in each group and then mention the actual numbers following drop out in the result section.

These explanations are given in figure one (The consort form).

The type of randomization should be mentioned

It is mentioned in the following text.

Who generated the allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to the intervention?

Was added.

Who generated the allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to the intervention?

Was added.

Write reference for these categories and also put this explanation where you said about random assignment.

Reference was added.

By whom or according to which criteria?

Was added.

What do you mean? Medical history of MS?

Yes, was corrected.

Was there any reason to select this range? Since it was acceptable until the age of 75, did you assess the elderly in terms of cognition?

Adult samples with physical, mental and cognitive ability to participate in the study were considered, and there was no problem in terms of cognitive ability for caregivers.

Do you mean informal caregivers? If yes, use this term instead of “primary caregiver”

Corrected.

How did you assess mental health?

Based on the questioning of history of mental illness and the opinion of the treatment team who were in contact with the patient for a long time.

Session

Corrected.

Did you match the participants' age, sex and also severity of disease? Did you consider the confounders in this study?

The main confounder factor was the type of MS disease, which was adjusted in the minimization table at the beginning of sampling. It was decided to adjust the effect of other factors if needed during data analysis, but no difference was observed.

Explain more details about randomization method in this study.

Was added.

Write reference for these categories and also put this explanation where you said about random assignment.

Reference was added.

Did not you measure any variable in the control group to determine the effect of intervention on them?

Demographic variables and dependent variables were measured for both groups.

Instruments

Was replaced

What variables are included? be mentioned

Mentioned.

Explain more about the fear questionnaire, by whom it was designed and what year was it, and was the validity and reliability determined in the research community? Was it used before in the community of MS patients? Be provided with reference. How was reliability measured in the present study?

Explained.

How did you provide the Farsi version of the questionnaire? How about its validity? How much was its reliability in your study? When the questionnaires were completed and who did it? When and how was the second round of completing the questionnaire completed? Was it immediately after the end of the intervention?

Corrected.

The training content needs a reference and also it should be mentioned in the four stages of the collaborative care model in a table. How about the intervals of sessions?

The required corrections were made.

This sentence has not a verb!

Was corrected.

Both of them were trained together or separately?

Responded.

What was the expertise of person who performed the training

Responded.

How about the care givers?

Was corrected.

By whom?

Mentioned.

what team

Mentioned.

What do you mean by team?

Mentioned.

They could not be blind, because you had not a placebo group.

These people did not know the exact objectives of the research and the study groups

Mention the descriptive statistics.

Was mentioned.

It needs revision.

Revised.

Do not repeat the values and numbers in the text if they have been shown in the tables.

Revised.

There is no figure in the manuscript.

Was added.

It was sent as a separate file

How about the result of assessing the normality of data?

Was added.

Delete the authors' names in the discussion and mention when and where the studies were done

Revised.

It seems the most difference is about the measuring variable, because they did not assess FOP. Moreover, you should compare the results with other studies that assessed change of fear following collaborative care.

Unfortunately, we did not find such a study.

What is the similarity of these strategies with collaborative care?

These studies were considered because they show that the dependent variable (fear of disease progression) can be manipulated.

Mention more details about matching in the method section.

These details were mentioned.

Double blinding was not possible in this study. Only data analyzer could be blind.

The person who collected the information did not know about the allocation of the samples also.

It seems you did not measure any variable in the control group to determine the effect of intervention on them, so it is not clear the results are related to training of participants, caregivers or both of them! In fact, the role of training the caregivers is not clear in this study!

Educational sessions were conducted with the presence of patients and caregivers, and the care program was designed and implemented in a collaborative manner (participation of the patient, family members, and health team).

The measurement of the dependent variable was performed only for patients and in the control group it was done in the same way as the intervention group.

These individual characteristics should be presented separately for patients and caregivers

Characteristics of family members were added to table one

Only 3 demographic variables?!!

Marital status was added, age is also mentioned in the text

Define these groups

Groups were defined in the table

Delete 100, the sign of % is enough.

Corrected.

Do you mean housewife?

Yes.

You reported Unemployed at the first row!!!

It was a typo, it was corrected.

All abbreviations should be written completely in the footnote of the table.

Were corrected.

Delete “Pearson “

Deleted.

All abbreviations should be written completely in the footnote of the table.

Corrected.

The inter and intra-group comparison of FOP in the collaborative care and control .group

.Title changed

!There is no figure

.Figure was added in the text

Some references need to be completed such as number 21. Someone also needs volume .and issue

Use the standard abbreviations for name of journals according to NLM. Write (Persian) in .front of Farsi references

Corrected

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 2 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 2 Nov 2023

Thanks for considering the comments. However, some corrections are insufficient, as indicated in the attachment. Furthermore, finalize all corrections using Track Changes before submitting the revised file.

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 reviewers, while thanking you for your valuable comments, below is the :answer to the corrections

Do you mean dysfunctional and functional fear? If fear is the noun of this sentence add it.

Because the word "fear" is mentioned at the beginning of the sentence, we did not find it necessary to repeat it. But still it was added.

Clarify that the care givers were one of the patient' family member

.Added

According to CONSORT, it should be corrected as 42 in the intervention and 43 in the control group. As I said previously, explain the final sample in the result section.

Corrected.

It is vague! Are these numbers the reliability or a validity index. Clarify in the text.

Corrected

Mention the names of descriptive statistics which were used in this study

Mentioned

Please write how many participants were finally assessed

Added.

Add this explanation.

It seems the most difference is about the measuring variable, because they did not assess FOP.

Added

You explanation about this comment is not enough, so add this limitation here.

It seems you did not measure any variable in the control group to determine the effect of intervention on them, so it is not clear the results are related to training of participants, caregivers or both of them! In fact, the role of training the caregivers is not clear in this study!

It seems that there is a false impression that the training of patients and caregivers is carried out in separate processes. While the intervention of this study was the designing and implementation of collaborative care with the participation of health care providers, patients and their family members. The intervention plan was personalized with the participation of patients, care givers and the doctor and nurse and was designed and implemented based on specific conditions and needs.

"Change to "care givers

.Changed

All abbreviations should be written completely in the footnote of the table not the page.

Added.

This comment was not considered!!

Use the standard abbreviations for name of journals according to NLM

Changed

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 8 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 8 Nov 2023

Thanks for the corrections.