

# Improving Illness Perception Through Self-Care Behavior Training: A Randomized Controlled Trial


Seyed Amir. Saadati<sup>\*1</sup> , Seyed Milad. Saadati<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Master of Clinical Science, School of Health Studies Department, Western University, Ontario, Canada



<sup>2</sup> Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology (LMP), University of Toronto, Canada

\* Corresponding author email address: Ssaadat6@uwo.ca

### Editor

Cain C. T. Clark   
Faculty of Health, Education, and  
Life Sciences, Birmingham City  
University, Birmingham, B15 3TN,  
U.K.  
scain.clark@coventry.ac.uk

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Maryam Saadat   
Lifeworks Holistic Counselling Centre, Dubai, UAE.  
Email: maryamsaadat@lifeworks.ae  
**Reviewer 2:** Parichehr. Mehdiabadi   
Department of School Psychology, University of East London, London, UK.  
Email: Parichehr.ma@aol.com

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The research question is relevant and well-formulated, addressing a gap in understanding the role of self-care behavior training on illness perception. The significance of this research is evident, given the increasing need for effective self-management strategies in chronic disease care. However, a more explicit statement of the study's hypothesis at the outset could enhance its impact.

The presentation of data is clear, with tables effectively summarizing the results. The use of mixed-design ANOVA is suitable for the study's objectives. However, discussing the assumptions checked for ANOVA in more detail and how any violations were addressed would strengthen the analysis section.

The discussion comprehensively interprets the findings, linking back to the literature review and highlighting the intervention's implications for practice. To improve, consider discussing alternative explanations for the findings and the potential impact of confounding variables not controlled in the study.

The paper acknowledges its limitations, including reliance on self-reported measures and its cross-sectional design. Future research directions are well-identified, suggesting a longitudinal approach and the inclusion of objective measures. Expanding on how future studies could explore the mechanisms underlying the observed changes in illness perception would be beneficial.

The writing is generally clear and concise. Minor grammatical and typographical errors could be corrected to enhance readability. Additionally, ensuring consistency in terminology and abbreviation definitions throughout the paper would improve its professionalism.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

### 1.2. *Reviewer 2*

Reviewer:

The paper is generally well-structured, with a clear progression from introduction to methods, results, and conclusion. However, it would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the theoretical foundation underpinning the intervention. Specifically, elaborating on how the Self-Regulatory Model informs the intervention's design could improve clarity.

The literature review is comprehensive, covering essential studies on illness perception, self-care behaviors, and the Self-Regulatory Model. To strengthen this section, consider including a critique of previous studies' limitations and how your research addresses these gaps.

The randomized controlled trial design is appropriate for the study's aims. However, the paper could benefit from more detail on the randomization process and the measures taken to minimize bias. Clarification on how participants were blinded to the study's hypothesis would add to the robustness of the methodology.

The study's adherence to ethical guidelines is noted, but providing more detail on the informed consent process and how participant confidentiality was maintained would reinforce the ethical rigor of the research.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. **Revised**

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.