Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 9 · Issue 4 · e123847

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# The Effect of Implementing a Rehabilitation Nursing Program on Hand Burn Patients' Daily Functioning: A Randomized Clinical Trial

Mahnaz Seyedoshohadaee, Tahereh Najafi Ghezeljeh, Mohammad Sadegh Sargolzaei, Tahereh Alsadat Khoubbin Khoshnazar, Daniyal Kohestani, Farnaz Jahantigh

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 Mar 2022 | 6 Sep 2022 | 18 Sep 2022 | 10.5812/mejrh-123847 |

## 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** Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 3
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 4
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 8
3 **Revision 2** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 9
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 10
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 12
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief ..... 13
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 14
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 16

## 1 Original submission

1 comment · 26 Apr 2022

### Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 26 Apr 2022

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article requires major revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

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 1:***

***AUTHOR REPLY:*** *Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below.*

***Burn statistics to be reported in Iran***

*Added*
***Explain the treatment approach, its importance, its gaps.***
***The need to study more carefully.***
***Rewrite the discussion***
***Rewrite the tables***

*Additional description added.*

***Reviewer 2:***

***AUTHOR REPLY:*** *Thank you for your comments. Our answers to your points are as follows.*

***What was the reason for using the covariance test?***

*For more accurate statistical analysis before and after the intervention*

**** Chi-square test is not in table 1?***

*Added*

***Use the words intervention or experimental in this study .***

*yes*

***The end of the first paragraph of page 15 written about the control group "in the control group, as evidenced by the paired student t-test (p <0.001)" is not correct.***

*Corrected*

***Exercises were performed by a physiotherapist, what is the reason for using the term rehabilitation nursing program? In article reference number 24, does not exist the word rehabilitation nursing program***.
*Rehabilitation nursing is a branch of nursing in the world that helps patients' rehabilitation by working with other disciplines. As described in the method, the intervention was performed in collaboration with several disciplines.*
.
*Reviewer 3:*
*major revision bedded. the comments are available in uploaded file.*

**AUTHOR REPLY:** Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below.

**Please use patient with hand burns or individuals with hand burns in all the manuscript**.

Ok

**Please mention the date of doing this research.This study was done in….. Between…. And…..**

Added

**Which randomization??**

The patients were randomly divided into two groups using the block randomization method.

**Burning is disorder not disease**

Yes

**The most important persons in rehabilitation team who can help are occupational therapists Please include it!!!!!!!!!!!!!**

Added

**In all the manuscript please write: Activities of Daily Living (ADL)**

Ok

**You can include the schematic figure of this model for better understanding**

Added

**When you say these studies, so you have to mention to the references more than one**.

Corrected

**The blocking was based on which characteristics of the patients**

There was no blinding(blocking) in this study

**Why 1 to 6?????**

Random quadruple without permutation in six card modes (ABBA- BABA- ABAB- BAAB- BBAA-AABB)

**Is it self report?**

Yes , Is the implementation method

**0 to 26**

**13×2=26**

The GADL questionnaire has 3 areas (self-care, home care and day care) and includes 13 questions. Each question has a Likert of 3 dependents (zero points) needing help and to some extent dependent (one point) and independent (two points). Overall score This tool is 0 to 16 points. And each subject according to the score he gets is placed in one of the three dependent categories (0 to 7 points) with the help (8 to 11 points) and independent (12 to 16 points) (Taheri Tanjani and Azadbakht, 2016).

**This is a translation not validityYou have to mention that which kind of avidity you assess, face? Content? And…..**

In the present study, the validity of the tool was confirmed through the translation & back-translation method and according to the views of five professors of the Nursing Faculty of Iran University of Medical Sciences

**Cronbach's alpha is for internal consistency, when you say completed twice by 20 I think you mean test retest reliability which is ICC After how long the questionnaires were completed twice by 20??After two weeks??**

The instrument's reliability was checked in a pilot study with 20 participants, retrieving a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.76.

**What is the routine nursing care?????????????**

**Please give explanation at least one paragraph.**

Routine interventions and nursing care during the treatment period include:

Control of fluid intake and excretion, prevention of infection, observance of sterile tips in case of using venous catheters, injections, tracheal suction and infected catheters.Relief of pain and discomfort of the patient, improvement of physical mobility and .....

It is not written here because it is clear

**How can you assess this???**

**In inclusion criteria section you said that the included patients should have no mentally dysfunction**

**How you assess it**

This was confirmed by a psychiatric nurse colleague

**Training is one part of your intervention**

Yes

**You have no follow up too Please mention this as a limitation**

Added.

## 2 Revision 1

3 comments · 25 Jun 2022 – 28 Jun 2022

### Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 25 Jun 2022

All my comments have been addressed in the manuscript. In my opinion, it is accepted, but English editing of the whole manuscript seems to be necessary.

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 27 Jun 2022

Dear authors
Manuscript ID 123847, titled “The Effectiveness of Implementing a Rehabilitation Nursing Model on the Daily Functioning of Patients with Hand Burns: A Randomized Clinical Trial”, which you submitted to the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies, has been reviewed. Based on the reviewers’ comments, we have determined that it requires minor revisions before a decision can be made about its suitability for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies.
Therefore, I invite you to respond to the comments below and revise your manuscript.
1. Have the manuscript edited by a native English-speaking editor.
2. Refer to APA for the formatting of the two tables.
3. The title of table 2 should be revised.

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 28 Jun 2022

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor’s comments, your article needs minor revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

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.

**Reviewer 1:**

**AUTHOR REPLY:** Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below.

**What are the study gap and the necessity of studying?**

It is mentioned at the end of the introduction section....

Regarding the extensive effects of burns on the victim's physical functioning, studies have mainly focused on wound healing approaches, surgical treatments, anxiety management, self-management training, and improving mental self-image. In a study, it was shown that patient education can be an effective strategy to boost patients' awareness and alleviate their anxiety (20). **Nevertheless, many of these methods are not systematic** (21). A rehabilitation model can significantly enhances the physical, mental, and social functioning of patients with hand burns (19).

**Define study variables in the problem statement**

The variables of hand burn, daily life activity and rehabilitation nursing model are defined in the introduction

**Report the validity of the measurement tool in Iran.**

This questionnaire was used for the first time in Iran and the validity of the tool was confirmed through the translation & back-translation method and according to the views of five professors of the Nursing Faculty of Iran University of Medical Sciences. The instrument's reliability was checked in a pilot study with 20 participants, retrieving a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.76.

**What does the statistical analysis of the data show?**

The results showed no statistically significant difference in the daily performance of the individuals assigned to the study groups before the intervention ($p = 0.29$). Based on the results of analysis of covariance, the overall mean score of performance showed a statistically significant difference between the two groups after the intervention, with a significantly higher score (i.e., better performance) in the intervention group ($p < 0.001$). Also, the results of the paired student t-test showed that the mean performance scores were significantly different before vs. after the intervention in the rehabilitation group ($p < 0.001$) but not in the control group.

**What chat is full?**

We did not understand!!

**What are the limitations and suggestions of the study?**

The suggestions were mentioned at the end of the discussion section and the limitations of the study were mentioned in the limitations section.

Reviewer 2:

**AUTHOR REPLY** :Thank you for your comments. Our answers to your points are as follows

**all my comments are well done in the manuscript. and in my opinion, it is accepted, but the English editing for whole the manuscript seems to be necessary.**

The article was edited by a native (American) editor.

Associate Editor 1:

**AUTHOR REPLY** :Thank you for your comments. Our answers to your points are as follows

**1.Edit the manuscript by a native English editor**

The article was edited by a native (American) editor.

**2. Look at APA for two tables formatting.**

Reorganized according to APA format.

**3. Title of table 2 should be revised**

The title of table number 2 was revised.

## 3 Revision 2

3 comments · 17 Aug 2022 – 20 Aug 2022

### Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Aug 2022

accepted

### Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 17 Aug 2022

Dear authors,
Your manuscript (ID 123847), titled “The Effectiveness of Implementing a Rehabilitation Nursing Model on the Daily Functioning of Patients with Hand Burns: A Randomized Clinical Trial”, which you submitted to the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies, has been reviewed. Based on the reviewers’ comments, we have determined that it requires minor revisions and a second review before a decision can be made about its suitability for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewers’ comments and revise your manuscript.
Please upload the final article file without tracked changes (upload the corrected manuscript).

### Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 20 Aug 2022

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor’s comments, your article needs minor revision. When revising your manuscript, please consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments carefully: please outline every change made in response to their comments and submit the required files.

4

# Revision 3

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 1:**

**AUTHOR REPLY** :Thanks for the comments of the respected referee

**What is meant by activities done by hand? Give an example of the daily life activities that are done by hand by mentioning the reference.**

Added
**In the introduction, the psychological damage caused by burns is mentioned. Mention its relationship with daily activities and study.**

Mentioned
**It is suggested to choose from common techniques and rehabilitation in hand burn and write why this method works. Or, in your own words, express the importance and superiority of the method over other rehabilitation methods.**

It was done
**State the previous studies that are similar to your research in the introduction and write them down.**

Compared
**Did surgery, fracture, etc. in the hand after or before the burn have an effect on the quality of entry and exit?**

Yes, they were one of the exclusion criteria
**Is Spilent using its login and logout features?**

Unfortunately, we did not understand the word " Spilent".
**In the implementation method, the type of intervention and its exercises are not clear. It is suggested that therapeutic interventions are briefly stated in the table.**

Was placed
**What is meant by routine rehabilitation treatments?**

Daily physiotherapy and occupational therapy by the hospital's physiotherapy unit
**Provide references for therapeutic interventions**

Provided
**In the introduction of the measuring tool, specify the activities of home care and self-care, etc**

Added

**The discussion shows that many Iranian studies (Aghajanzadeh, Mohammadi, Najafi, etc.) have been conducted on patients with hand burns. What distinguishes you and your superior work from it? What is your explanation?**

Our study was different in terms of sample size, the amount of intervention,target population and the type of intervention and it is considered one of the strong points of the study.

The difference between our study and Aghajanzadeh, 2019 in research population, degree of burn and time and type intervention. For example, we conducted rehabilitation nursing intervention lasted five weeks and was delivered following two steps. in The study only included patients 12 days after the day their burn wounds had healed.

In Mohammadi's study was coduct in cardiac patients (acute coronary syndrome), but our study was conducted in patients with hand burns in three degrees.

Our study, significantly boosted physical & mental functioning, as well as social relationships and general health in patients with hand burns. Overall, our findings reiterated the need for implementing and delivering a proficient, standard, and comprehensive educational rehabilitation program to improve the performance of burn patients.

**It seems that lines 261 to 268 are not relevant to your study because they refer to some related topics in the lower limb.be written again. Write why this study is what it is or the method it has presented that previous studies have done. Compare your results, alignment or mismatch results with other**

Thank you for your comments. Our answers to your points was revised.

Lines 261 to 263 was deleted.

## 4 Revision 3

1 comment · 18 Sep 2022

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 18 Sep 2022

Dear Authors
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS. We hope to receive other high-quality articles from your group.