Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 9 · Issue 4 · e130324

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Environmental Barriers Affecting the Function of Individuals with Multiple Sclerosis Based on ICF Core Set

Parvin Valizadeh Najafi, Afsoon Hassani Mehraban, Malek Amini, Fatemeh Motaharinezhad

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
31 Jul 2022	11 Sep 2022	18 Sep 2022	10.5812/mejrh-130324

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, Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2

2 **Revision 1** Referee 3, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 5

Authors' reply to reviewers 6

Reviewer and editor comments 11

3 **Revision 2** Referee 3, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 12

Authors' reply to reviewers 13

Reviewer and editor comments 15

1 Original submission

5 comments · 6 Aug 2022 – 22 Aug 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

REJECT 6 Aug 2022

Dear Authors
I have read this manuscript and have the following comments, which I hope will help you provide further clarification about certain points.
Abstract:
- In the conclusion, what do you mean by the first sentence? It seems that "change" is not the right word for this sentence.
Introduction:
- Paragraph 2 Line 43: "Jalili investigated showed …" contains two separate and independent verbs brought together. Please correct.
- Paragraph 2 Line 45: "most effective functional barriers…": "barriers" is a negative word and therefore does not go together with "effective." It seems that "strong" or "disabling" is more appropriate.
- Paragraph 5 Line 95: You have given detailed explanations about your outcome assessment in the introduction, which is not required at all, and you have repeated them in the methods section.
- My main concern is this: at the end of the introduction, what was your conclusion about previously conducted studies? What is the superiority or advantage of your study compared to previous studies and especially Jalili's study? What limitations did previous studies have? Have you covered them? The necessity and innovation of your study are not clear at all.
Unfortunately, the obtained information does not seem to significantly contribute to increasing the available evidence!
Methods:
- No explanation has been given about the cognitive status of participants, which can definitely affect their participation. Did you not consider people's cognitive function as an entry criterion or as demographic information?
Results and Conclusion:
- Most of the participants were women and housewives. Certainly, the barriers to their participation are very different from those faced by men and working people! This can affect the findings and their generalizability. You could mention this as a limitation of the study.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 17 Aug 2022

1- In the introduction, the article lacks integrity and needs to be revised and rewritten.
2- The necessity of the study is not clearly explained.
3- On what basis was the sample size of 140 people with MS determined? Did you use a specific formula for the sample size? If yes, please mention it in the text.
4- Have the validity and reliability of the CHIEF and FIM instruments been assessed in Iran? Please mention this and add references.
5- What was the recruitment process for the participants? Where was the study conducted?
6- Most of the references mentioned in the Conclusion are old. Newer references need to be cited.
7- The whole text of the article needs to be revised; there are many grammatical problems in the text.

Referee 3 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 21 Aug 2022

The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.
Abstract
• In the results section, report the strength of the relationship in addition to the significance.
• Please modify the keywords to use MeSH terms.
Introduction
• I think it would be helpful if more information were provided about ICF environmental factors in the Introduction. (Products and technology, Natural environment and human-made changes to the environment, Support and relationships, Attitudes, Services, systems, and policies)
• The different parts of the introduction are not properly connected and need to be revised.
• Please provide a reference for line 35. (According to statistics. . ..)
Method
• The Craig Hospital Inventory of Environmental Factors subscales are related to ICF environmental factors, but they did not cover all factors (such as Products and technology). Moreover, CHIEF was not developed based on the ICF. Please provide more information and references that support CHIEF and cover all ICF environmental factors. I think this is the main problem of this study.
• If you have used the Persian version of CHIEF, please mention its validity and reliability.
• How was the sample size calculated?
Result
• In table 1, how did you evaluate "Severity of disability based on ICF"? With which instrument and by whom?
• Please write the mean and standard deviation of the FIM in the text or table.
• In table 2, the standard deviations of the CHIEF subscales are not reported. Please correct this.
• Discussion
• In line 199, the reference is written in the wrong format.
• In lines 200-203, the reference is missing.
• Lines 195-203: In order to interpret the results of the correlation analysis, in addition to significance, the magnitude of the correlation is also very important. Provide more information and reasons for the relationship between the FIM and CHIEF in the obtained results.
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 21 Aug 2022

Dear authors,
Your manuscript (ID 130324), titled "Environmental barriers affecting the function of people with multiple sclerosis based on ICF core set", 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 major 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 comments below and revise your manuscript.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 22 Aug 2022

Dear Authors
According to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments, your article needs 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.

August 24, 2022

Response to Reviewers Comments

Dear Dr Fatemeh Ehsani
Editor-in-Chief of Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies:

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that .the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find .our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication

,Sincerely

Reviewer 1

We appreciate that the reviewer's comments. In the text the corrections is shown in yellow highlight.
The followings are our point-by-point responses:

- In the introduction, the article lacks integrity and needs to be revised and rewritten.
  Response: The article has been edited natively. Its certificate is attached.

- The necessity of the study is not clearly explained**.**

  Response:. We have improved this section in the text.

  - On what basis were 140 people with MS? Did you use a specific formula for the sample size? If yes, please mention it in the text.

  Response: We used the available sample. We also cited previous studies. No special formula was used.

  - Has the validity and reliability of CHIEF and FIM instruments been performed in Iran? Please mention and add references.
  Response: This was done and was mentioned in the text.

  - What was the recruitment process for the participants? Where was the setting Study?
  Response: We have improved this section in the text

- Most of the references mentioned in the Conclusion are old. Newer references need to be cited.
  Response: In the study, an attempt was made to use newer references. One of the causes of this problem was the lack of new studies.

Reviewer 2

We appreciate that the reviewer's comments. In the text the corrections is shown in blue highlight.
The followings are our point-by-point responses:

Abstract;
- In the conclusion, what do you mean by the first sentence? It seems that "change" is not the right word for this sentence.

Response: Thank you very much to the respectable reviewer for his careful opinion.

This word was modified.

Introduction;

- Paragraph 2 Line 43; Jalili investigated showed ….two separate and independent verbs brought together. Please correct

Response: It was corrected.

- Paragraph 2 Line 45; most effective functional barriers… barriers is a negative word and therefore does not go together with effective. It seems that strong or disabling is more appropriate.

Response: It was corrected.

- Paragraph 5 Line 95; You have given detailed explanations about your outcome assessment in the introduction, which is not required at all, and you have repeated it again in the method section.

Response: We reviewed the text again and improved them in the text.

- My main concern is that at the end of the introduction, what was your conclusion about previously conducted studies? What is the superiority or advantage of your study compared to previous studies and especially Jalili study? What limitations did previous studies have? Have you covered them? The necessity and innovation of your study is not clear at all.

Response: See Response# reviewer 1 in the top of this text**.**

Some of your concerns were answered in the comments of the first reviewer. The necessity of the study was explained in two paragraphs along with the mention of past limited studies.

Considering that participation is the main goal in rehabilitation interventions, the results of this study by identifying environmental barriers and their impact on participation can help with managing the treatment program and providing treatment recommendations to the patient.

- No explanation has been given about the cognitive status of participants, which can definitely affect their participation. Did you not consider people's cognitive function as entry criteria or demographic information?

Response: In our original study, we used MMST for cognitive screening. In this study, we mentioned it in the inclusion criteria.

- Most of the participants were women and housewives. Certainly, the barriers to their participation are very different from men and working people! And it can affect the findings and its generalizability. You could mention this as a limitation of the study.

Response: We added it in the text and the section of limitations.

Reviewer 3

We appreciate that the reviewer's comments. In the text the corrections is shown in green highlight.
The followings are our point-by-point responses:

- The manuscript needs extensive revision for language and grammar.

Response: See Response# reviewer 1 in the top of this text**.**

The article has been edited natively. Its certificate is attached.

- Please modify keywords for MeSH terms.

Response: We modify them.

Introduction
- I think it would be helpful if more information is provided about ICF environmental factors in the Introduction. (Products and technology, Natural environment and human-made changes to the environment, Support and relationships, Attitudes, Services, systems, and policies)

Response: This tool was introduced in the method.

- Different part of the introduction does not have a proper correlation together and needs to be revised.

Response: We improve it in the text.

- Please provide a reference for line 35. (According to statistics….)

Response: We added it.

Method
- Craig Hospital Inventory of Environmental Factors subscales have related to ICF environmental factors but they didn't cover all factors (such as Products and technology). Moreover, CHIEF didn't develop based on ICF. Please provide more information and references that support CHIEF and cover all ICF environmental factors. I think this is the main problem of this study.

Response: Yes, thank you for your attention. This is one of the limitations of the study and, in other words, the tool. However, studies have shown that this tool has a lot of similarities with the concepts ICF, which covers this defect to a large extent.
- If you have used the Persian version of CHIEF please mention its validity and reliability.

Response: See Response# reviewer 1 in the top of this text**.** We added it in the text.

- How was the sample size calculated?

Response: See Response# reviewer 1 in the top of this text**.**

We used the available sample. We also cited previous studies. No special formula was used.

Result

- In table 1, how did you evaluate “Severity of disability based on ICF”? By which instrument and who?

Response: In the welfare centers, specific tools are used for this evaluation, which are specific to these centers. These scales were used. It should be noted that these scales are in accordance with the standards of the World Health Organization and are valid. Because we used the previous results, we did not mention the name of the tool.

- Please write the mean and standard deviation of the FIM in the text or table.

Response: We added it in the results in text.

- In table 2, the standard deviation of the CHIEF subscales are not written, correct it.

Response: We added it in the table 2.

Discussion

- In line 199, The reference is written in the wrong format.

Response: We corrected it in the text.

- In lines 200-203, The reference is not written.

Response: We improved this sections and added reference.

- Lines 195-203, In order to interpret the results in correlation analysis, in addition to significance, the magnitude of the correlation is also very important. Provide more information and reasons about the relationship between the FIM and CHIEF for the obtained results.

Response: We improved this sections and highlighted.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 2 Sep 2022 – 10 Sep 2022

Referee 3 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 2 Sep 2022

I read the manuscript, and thankfully many corrections have been made. The manuscript can be accepted after a few revisions that are listed below:
In the method section, write how you obtained the information about the severity of the disability.
Mention the Craig Hospital Inventory of Environmental Factors as a limitation of your study because it does not completely cover the environmental factors of ICF.

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 3 Sep 2022

Respectfully
The corrections to the article have been made according to the reviewer's suggestions and are approved.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 3 Sep 2022

Dear authors
The manuscript (ID 130324), titled “Environmental barriers affecting the function of people with multiple sclerosis based on ICF core set", 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 with no second review for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies.
Sincerely,

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 10 Sep 2022

Dear Authors
Based on the reviewers' and associate editor’s comments, your article requires 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.

September 11, 2022

Response to Reviewers Comments

Dear Dr Fatemeh Ehsani
Editor-in-Chief of Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies:

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We have carried out the experiments that .the reviewers suggested and revised the manuscript accordingly

Please find attached a point-by-point response to reviewer's concerns. We hope that you find .our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication

,Sincerely

Reviewer 1

Respectfully, The corrections to the article have been made according to the reviewer's suggestions and are approved.

Response: Thank you so much.

Reviewer 2

We appreciate that the reviewer’s comments. In the text the corrections is shown in yellow highlight.
The followings are our point-by-point responses:

I read the manuscript and thankfully many corrections have been made. The manuscript can be accepted after a few revisions that list below:
In the method section, write how you obtained the information about the severity of the disability.

Response: We added this section and highlighted.

Mention the Craig Hospital Inventory of Environmental Factors as a limitation of your study because not completely cover the environmental factors of ICF.

Response: We added it in the text and highlighted.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 14 Sep 2022 – 18 Sep 2022

Referee 3 Reviewer

ACCEPT 14 Sep 2022

Corrections have been made and the manuscript is now acceptable.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 14 Sep 2022

Dear Authors,
We are pleased to inform you that your article has been Accepted for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies.
Wishing you the best in the next scientific phase of your life.

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 qualified articles from your group.