






Effectiveness of Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy on Mental Pain, Distress Tolerance and Psychological Hardiness in Breast Cancer Patients

Seyed Hadi. Seyed Ali Tabar¹, Zohreh. Zadhan^{1*}


¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: zohrehzadhan@kmanresce.ca

Editor

Masoumeh Mousavi¹
Assistant Professor of Pediatric
Psychiatry, Department of
Psychology, Faculty of Educational
Sciences and Psychology, Shahid
Beheshti University, Tehran, Iran
Mousavi68.ma@yahoo.com

Reviewers

Abdollah Omidi¹
Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, Kashan University of Medical
Sciences, Iran. Email: abomidi@kaums.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer

Date: 30 November

The study addresses an important area of research, but there are several areas that need improvement before it can be considered for publication.

Reviewer: The methodology section of the manuscript lacks clarity and detail. It is essential to provide a clear description of the study design, participant recruitment process, randomization (if applicable), intervention protocols, and outcome measures used. A more thorough explanation of the research methodology is needed to ensure the study's replicability.

Response: Corrected.

Reviewer: The manuscript contains very short paragraphs that disrupt the flow of the text. It is advisable to combine or expand these short paragraphs to improve readability and maintain the coherence of the narrative.

Response: Corrected.

Reviewer: The conclusion of the article lacks coherence and does not effectively summarize the study's findings. Consider revising and restructuring the conclusion to provide a concise summary of the key results and their implications for breast cancer patients and future research.

Response: Corrected.

Reviewer: The manuscript would greatly benefit from a discussion section that not only summarizes the results but also provides an in-depth analysis and interpretation of the findings. Furthermore, the authors should compare their results with previous studies in the field, discussing similarities, differences, and potential explanations.

Response: Corrected.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.