Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Volume 12 · Issue 2 · e146484

OPEN PEER REVIEW

# The Impact of Group Psychoeducation for Mothers of Children with Cerebral Palsy: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Hossein Alibakhshi, Zahra Davoudi, Narges Damirchi, Maryam Kavian, Mona Siminghalam

| SUBMITTED | REVISED | ACCEPTED | DOI |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 Mar 2024 | 7 Apr 2024 | 15 Apr 2024 | 10.5812/mejrh-146484 |

## 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, Editor-in-Chief ..... 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief ..... 4
**Authors' reply to reviewers** ..... 5
**Reviewer and editor comments** ..... 13

## 1 Original submission

2 comments · 9 Mar 2024 – 11 Mar 2024

### Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 9 Mar 2024

This manuscript is titled “The Impact of Group Psychoeducation for Mothers of Children with Cerebral Palsy”.

Abstract

- The method section is incomplete, and it is necessary to add the interventions for both groups and their duration.

Introduction

- The first paragraphs of this section focus on the "mothers of children with cerebral palsy", but in the last paragraph, the word "caregiver" was used, which can be an umbrella term and include many people who take care of the child. The terminology should be consistent throughout the manuscript.

Methods

- Line 72-74 is not clear. Were the participants selected based on the neurologist's opinion or the occupational therapist's assessment?
- The process of recruiting the participants is not clear. At the beginning, how many participants were invited to the study, and how were they invited?
- It seems that the inclusion and exclusion criteria should be considered in two separate sections for mothers and children with cerebral palsy.
- Did the mothers' age and cognitive level not play an important and influential role in the study process? And why were they not included in the inclusion criteria?
- Why were exclusion criteria not considered for children? Could factors such as seizures not affect the mothers' participation in the research and their mood levels?
- The process and method of randomization were not described. Also, a valid reference should be added.
- The sample size was determined based on the pilot study, but the calculation is not clear. Which formula was used, and how many units were changed in which tool? A reference needs to be added.
- Was a demographic questionnaire used? What items did it include? Please add this information to the measure section.
- It is better to add lines 102-113 to the beginning of the method section, after the study design. However, this part is incomplete. Who invited the participants to the study, and by what means (telephone, etc.)? Who explained the objectives of the study, and what expertise and experience did they have?
- It is suggested that this section be divided into several subsections: research design, participants, research process, measures, …
- The intervention consisted of 5 sessions. How long did each session last?
- Who conducted the evaluations, what expertise did they have, and where were the evaluations conducted? Was the assessor blinded?
- Who implemented the intervention? Did he or she receive the necessary training beforehand?
- Table 1 needs to be described in more detail.
- There is no mention of following the CONSORT guidelines in the text.
- What caused one participant to drop out at the post-intervention evaluation?

Conclusion

- The comparison between the results of the current study and previous studies is not clear.

- What are the implications of this research for the future and for the occupational therapy literature? These should be added to the conclusion.

**Editor-in-Chief** MAJOR REVISION 11 Mar 2024

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.

**Author's response to reviews**

**Manuscript ID: 146484** **Date: 25/3/2024**

**Title:** The Impact of Group Psychoeducation for Mothers of Children with Cerebral Palsy

**Author's response to reviews:**

Dear Editor of Journal of Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies, We are grateful to the dear editors and dear reviewers for their time and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have implemented their comments and suggestions and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the initial version of the manuscript are **HIGHLIGHTED** in added sentences in the revised version. Below, we also provide a point-by-point response explaining how we have addressed each of the editors or reviewers' comments. We look forward to the outcome of your assessment.

Yours sincerely,

……
……
……
……
……

## Dear Reviewer: 1

1. Comment: Refer to the studies done in Iran

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. A related Persian language study has been added to the introduction (Blue highlighted)

2. Comment: The necessity of conducting the study should be stated carefully.

Thank you for your valuable comment. The necessity of the study was revised. (Blue highlighted)

## Dear Reviewer 2:

## Abstract

Comment: The method section is incomplete and it is necessary to add the interventions for both of groups and its duration.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The interventions for both groups and its duration were added. (Yellow highlighted)

### Introduction

- In the first paragraphs of this section, focused on the "mothers of children with cerebral palsy",but in the last paragraph, the word "caregiver "was used, which can be an umbrella term and include many people who take care of the child. The whole of manuscript should be unified.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. The caregiver was changed to mother in the last paragraph(Yellow highlighted).

### Methods

- Line 72-74 is not clear. Were the participants selected based on the neurologist's opinion or the occupational therapist's assessment?

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. The corrections have been made as you requested. (Yellow highlighted).

- The process of recruitment of the participants is not clear. In the beginning, how many and how they were invited to study and...

Response: Thank you for point this out. The process of recruitment of the participants has been rewritten. (Yellow highlighted).

- It seems that the inclusion and exclusion criteria should be considered in two separate sections for both mothers and children with cerebral palsy.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The inclusion and exclusion criteria have been considered in two separate sections for mothers and children. (Yellow highlighted).

- The age of the mothers and their cognitive level did not play an important and influential role in the study process? And why was it not included to the inclusion criteria?

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made to method. (Yellow highlighted).

- Why was exclusion criteria not considered for children? Could the occurrence of some factors such as seizure and... not be effective in the research process of mothers' participation and their mood level?

Response:Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in  method.(Yellow highlighted).

- The process and method of randomization was not described. Also, it should be added valid reference.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- Based on the pilot study, the sample size was determined but it is not clear. Based on which formula and how many units were changed in which tool? It needs add a reference.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- Demographic questionnaire was used? What items did it include? Please add to the measure section.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- It is better to add lines 102-113 to the beginning of the method section and after the study design. Of course, this part is incomplete. Who did invite the participants to the study and by what way (telephone, etc.)? Who explained the objectives of the study and with what expertise and experience?

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- It is suggested to categorize this section in several subheading: research design, participants, research process, measures, …..

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- The intervention consisted of 5 sessions. How long did each session last?

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The duration of each session has been added in Table 1. Additionally, the methods section notes that each session lasted approximately 90 minutes.

- Who and with what expertise and where did the evaluations? Was assessor blind?

Response: Thank you for the feedback. We have clarified in the Methods section that assessments were conducted by a trained research assistant who was blinded to group assignment and uninvolved in delivering the intervention. This helped ensure objective and unbiased administration and scoring of evaluations.

- Who implicate the intervention? Did he or she get the necessary trainings before that?

Thank you for the feedback. We have clarified in the Methods section that interventions were conducted by an expert psychotherapist.

- Table 1 needs to be mentioned with more detail.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The time of each session was added to the table. Due to the journal's word limit policies, we were unable to provide more details about the treatment sessions in the table.

- There is no mention of following the CONSORT guidelines in the text.

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the method.(Yellow highlighted).

- What were the causes of one participant's drop in the post-evaluation?

Response : Thank you for your valuable comment. Reasons of rejection were added in the consort diagram.

Conclusion

- The comparison between the results of the current study and previous studies is not clear well?

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in conclusion.(Yellow highlighted).

- What is the implications of the this research in the future and in occupational therapy literature? It should be added to the conclusion..

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the conclusion.(Yellow highlighted).

## **Dear Reviewer 3**:

- The introduction lacks the necessary structure and coherence and must be revised.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. Requested changes have been made in the Introduction.(blue highlighted).

- The importance and necessity of conducting the study have not been well-expressed

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. Requested changes have been made in the Introduction.(blue highlighted).

- In the discussion section of the present study, non-aligned studies and the reasons for their differentiation are not well-mentioned

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in  Discussion.(green highlighted).

**Dear Associate Editor 1:**

Dear authors,

Manuscript ID 146484 titled “The Impact of Group Psychoeducation for Mothers of Children with Cerebral Palsy", 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 before being considered for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies.

The reviewer(s) have recommended additional revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

Abstract:

• Write numbers with two decimal places

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested changes have been made in the Abstract

• Correctly identify the type of study

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The type of study has been changed to a quasi-experimental study

Keywords should be chosen by using MeSH.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. Keywords have been chosen using MeSH terms.

Introduction

• You should add a summary of the literature review in the

• What is the study innovation?

• In the introduction section, mention a related Iranian study.

• State the purpose of your study in the final paragraph of the introduction.

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. A summary of the relevant literature has been added. The innovation of this study is noted as examining the effects of a brief group psychoeducation intervention. A related Iranian study has been cited. The purpose of the study is stated in the concluding paragraph. (blue highlighted).

Method:

• Please provide details about the assessment tools.

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. Details about the assessment tools (BDI, BAI, SF-36) have been provided.

• Ensure to mention the signing of the informed consent form in the text.

Response :Thank you for your valuable comment. The mention of signed informed consent has been included.

• Explain the randomization method. The table description should be included in the text

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The randomization method is described.

• Was this study single-blind or not?

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. Blinding is clarified as double-blind.

• The authors should identify who was responsible for completing the questionnaire and provide information regarding their qualifications

Response:Thank you for your valuable comment. It has been mentioned that a trained examiner (OT student) was responsible for completing questionnaires.

• How do you determine sample size? (Is the sample size enough for your result?)

Response : Thank you for your valuable comment. Based on a preliminary study with 14 participants, a power analysis using the formula for sample size calculation for a single population proportion: (n = (Zα/2)2 * p(1-p) / d2)(23) determined a final sample size of 24 per group was needed to detect a difference with 95% power and an alpha of 0.05.

• Clearly state the education level of the assessor.

Response : Thank you for your valuable comment. To maintain objectivity, all assessments - including those conducted at pre-intervention baseline, post-intervention, and during follow-up periods - were administered by a trained examiner a fourth-year occupational therapy student, who was blinded to group assignment and uninvolved in delivering the psychoeducation program or other aspects of the intervention.

• The method description should be thorough and precisely explain the procedures followed.

Response : Thank you for your valuable comment. The method is described thoroughly and precisely explained the procedures followed.

Results

• Write the minimum and maximum age of the participants

Response:Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested change has been made in the results

Discussion:

- Please provide a more detailed description of the application of the study.

- Authors should clarify the results, make references to previous research, offer interpretations, and provide implications or recommendations.

- The discussion requires better organization and may need some restructuring.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments which will help strengthen our Discussion section. This section has been fundamentally revised.

Conclusion:

- Authors should restate the research problem, summarize the arguments/findings, and suggest key takeaways.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments which will help strengthen our Conclusion section. This section has been fundamentally revised.

Table:

- Tables should adhere to APA style.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. The requested change has been made

## 2 Revision 1

3 comments · 9 Apr 2024 – 15 Apr 2024

### Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 9 Apr 2024

Thank you for all these corrections and the organized way you highlighted the changes!
Only add the study design in the method section: Single- or double-blind?

### Associate Editor

ACCEPT 14 Apr 2024

Dear authors,
I am delighted to inform you that your manuscript titled "The Impact of Group Psychoeducation for Mothers of Children with Cerebral Palsy; A Randomized Controlled Trial" has been accepted for publication in the Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies.
Sincerely,

### Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 15 Apr 2024

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.