




# Psychological Resilience During Illness in Patients Recovered from Cancer

Sachin. Gupta<sup>1</sup>, Jinghua. Li<sup>2\*</sup>, LuXin. Zhou<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Psychology, The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Vadodra, India

<sup>2</sup> Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China

<sup>3</sup> Affiliated Kangning Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Wenzhou, China

\* Corresponding author email address: [jingli@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:jingli@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

### Editor

Netty Herawati<sup>id</sup>  
Department of Social Science & Cultural Science. Program Study of Psychology University of Trunojoyo Madura, East Java, Indonesia  
[herawati.netty9@gmail.com](mailto:herawati.netty9@gmail.com)

### Reviewers

**Reviewer 1:** Stuart Gilmour<sup>id</sup>  
Department of Global Health Policy, University of Tokyo, Japan.  
Email: [stuartgilmour@u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:stuartgilmour@u-tokyo.ac.jp)

**Reviewer 2:** Yuantao Song<sup>id</sup>  
Department of Medical Statistics, School of Public Health & Center for Health Information Research & Sun Yat-sen Global Health Institute, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China. Email: [yuantaosong@mail.sysu.edu.cn](mailto:yuantaosong@mail.sysu.edu.cn)

## 1. Round 1

### 1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

The introduction broadly outlines the significance of understanding psychological resilience in cancer survivors but fails to clearly delineate the specific research gap your study aims to fill. Consider refining this section by specifically stating how your research extends existing knowledge, perhaps by focusing on understudied demographic groups or resilience mechanisms not covered extensively in prior studies.

While the literature review is comprehensive, it primarily summarizes existing studies without critically examining their limitations or how they directly relate to your study's objectives. Enhance this section by integrating a critique of these studies, discussing limitations, and explicitly linking their findings to your research questions.

The results are well-documented in terms of emerging themes from the data; however, they could be strengthened by connecting these findings more explicitly to existing psychological resilience theories or models. This could involve discussing how the themes support or challenge these theories.

The discussion makes broad claims about the implications for clinical practice but lacks specific, actionable recommendations. Expand this section to offer detailed guidance on how healthcare providers can implement your findings in practical settings, possibly including program development or policy changes.

The limitations acknowledge the qualitative nature and sample size but do not address potential researcher bias in data interpretation. Discuss how reflexivity was maintained throughout the analysis process to mitigate this bias.

The title could be made more specific to reflect the unique aspects of your study. For example, if the study emphasizes a particular type of cancer or a unique demographic, this should be reflected in the title to immediately convey the specific focus of the research.

The abstract provides a good overview of the study but could include key quantitative or qualitative results to give readers a clearer understanding of the study outcomes. This addition would make the abstract more informative and compelling.

The theoretical framework guiding the study is mentioned briefly but could be expanded. A deeper exploration of how and why these theories were chosen and how they specifically apply to your study's context would provide a stronger foundation for the research.

The use of purposive sampling is mentioned, but the rationale behind choosing this method over others is not clearly articulated. Providing justification for this choice, including how it best serves the research objectives, would enhance the methodological rigor.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

The description of participant demographics lacks detail regarding the socio-economic backgrounds and educational levels of participants, which could influence resilience strategies. Adding this information would strengthen the validity of your findings and help in understanding the diversity within the sample.

It's mentioned that interviews were conducted by trained researchers, but there is no mention of how consistency was maintained across different interviewers. Detailing the training process or the use of a standardized protocol would lend more credibility to the qualitative data collected.

The analysis section mentions the use of NVivo and a grounded theory approach but does not discuss inter-coder reliability. Including a statement about how coding consistency was ensured (e.g., through independent coding of a subset of transcripts by multiple researchers) would strengthen your methodology.

Consider including the semi-structured interview guide as an appendix to provide readers with a clearer understanding of the data collection instruments and the depth of questions asked. This transparency can enhance the replicability of the study.

While the main themes are well-developed, the sub-themes could use more detailed development. Each sub-theme should be supported by direct quotes from participants to enhance the richness and authenticity of the qualitative analysis.

The discussion would benefit from a more detailed comparison between your findings and those of previous studies. This could involve a table or a detailed narrative comparison, highlighting similarities and differences to contextualize your results within the existing literature.

The conclusion briefly mentions future research but could be expanded to suggest specific studies or methodologies that could further explore and validate your findings. This guidance could be invaluable for other researchers interested in this area of study.

Response: Revised and uploaded the manuscript.

## 2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.