

Article history: Received 16 May 2023 Revised 22 June 2023 Accepted 26 June 2023 Published online 01 July 2023

Journal of Personality and Psychosomatic Research



Open Peer-Review Report

Mind-Body Interactions in Chronic Pain Sufferers: A Qualitative Study on Personality Factors

Ali. Aghaziarati^{1*}^(b), Hu Jun²^(b), Guang-Song Dai³^(b)

¹ Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond Hill, Ontario, Canada ² Shandong University of Engineering and Vocational Technology Jinan, Shandong Province, China ³ School of Psychology, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510631, China

* Corresponding author email address: aliaghaziarati@kmanresce.ca

Editor	R e v i e w e r s
Saeid. Motevalli	Reviewer 1: Yaliu Yang [®]
Department of Psychology, Faculty	Marriage and Family Therapy Department, Iona College, New Rochelle, NY, United
of Social Sciences & Liberal Arts,	States. Email: yaliuyang@iona.edu
UCSI University, Kuala Lumpur,	Reviewer 2: Mehdi Rostami
Malaysia	Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
saeid@ucsiuniversity.edu.my	Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: mehdirostami@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction effectively sets the stage for the research. However, it would benefit from a clearer explanation of the specific personality traits examined. Consider explicitly stating the key traits (e.g., neuroticism, conscientiousness) early in the introduction to guide the reader's understanding.

The development of the interview guide is briefly mentioned. Including a table or appendix with the interview questions would provide transparency and allow for better replication of the study.

The table categorizing the themes and subcategories is very useful. However, providing more context or examples for each concept listed (e.g., specific quotes from participants) would make the themes more tangible and relatable.

The conclusion mentions future research directions but could be more specific. Highlight particular methodological approaches or specific populations that would benefit from further study (e.g., longitudinal studies, diverse cultural contexts).

The ethical considerations section mentions adherence to the Helsinki Declaration but lacks specific details about the ethics approval process. Include information on the institutional review board (IRB) or ethics committee that reviewed and approved the study.

Ensure all references are complete and correctly formatted according to the journal's guidelines. Double-check for any missing DOI numbers or incomplete citations.

The sentence "Data were collected until theoretical saturation was achieved" could be clarified by explaining what 'theoretical saturation' entails for readers unfamiliar with the concept.

The sentence "Traditional biomedical approaches often fall short as they primarily target physical symptoms without adequately addressing the psychological and emotional dimensions that significantly influence the pain experience" could be broken into two sentences for better readability.

Define key terms such as "maladaptive cognitive patterns" to ensure clarity for readers who may not be familiar with specific psychological jargon.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

While the introduction references relevant studies, it could be enriched by including more recent research on the role of personality traits in chronic pain management. This would provide a more comprehensive backdrop for the study's rationale.

The abstract outlines the study's objectives but could be more precise. Instead of saying "to explore the mind-body interactions," specify the main questions or hypotheses that guided the research. For example, "to investigate how specific personality traits such as neuroticism and conscientiousness influence chronic pain perception and management."

The study uses purposive sampling, which is appropriate for qualitative research. However, providing more details on why specific inclusion criteria were chosen (e.g., chronic pain duration, diagnosis type) would strengthen the justification for the sample's representativeness.

The concept of theoretical saturation is mentioned, but it would be beneficial to elaborate on how saturation was determined during the data collection process. Describe any indicators or criteria used to assess saturation.

The process of thematic analysis is described but could be enhanced by including a diagram or visual representation of the coding process. This would illustrate how initial codes were grouped into themes and sub-themes, enhancing the reader's understanding of the analysis.

Mentioning the specific version of NVivo used and any key features of the software that facilitated the analysis would add to the methodological rigor. Also, describe how the software was used in the coding and theme development process.

The demographic information provided is comprehensive but could include more detailed statistics (e.g., mean and standard deviation for age) to enhance clarity and precision.

The discussion integrates findings with existing literature well. However, it could benefit from a more critical analysis of how the current study's findings align or contrast with previous studies, particularly regarding the influence of personality traits on chronic pain.

While practical implications are discussed, expanding on specific recommendations for healthcare providers based on the study's findings would be beneficial. For example, suggest specific mind-body interventions tailored to different personality traits.

The sentence "Cognitive appraisals including catastrophizing and self-blame were identified in 70% (14 out of 20) of the interviews" should clarify whether this refers to the number of participants or the number of interviews conducted.

Enhance the credibility of findings by including more direct quotes from participants. For instance, following the quote about anxiety with a quote illustrating depression would provide a richer context.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

JPPR June of Provided and Produced Reserved E-ISSN: 3041-8542 Editor's decision: Accepted. Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.