Review of: "Quality of Life and Its Predictor Factors Among Iranian Gastrointestinal Cancer Survivors"

Hassan Mahmoodi[1]

1 Kurdistan University of Medical Sciences

Thank you for your invitation.

Your introduction is comprehensive and covers many essential points, but there are some areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity, flow, and the overall impact of the narrative. Below are some suggestions for improvement:

1. Clarify the Global and Local Context:

- **Global Context:** The opening sentences mention the global burden of gastrointestinal (GI) cancers but can be more succinct. Emphasize the significance of colorectal cancer (CRC) within the global context early on.
- **Local Context:** The transition to the context of Iran is good but can be made smoother by connecting it to the global burden and the importance of studying QoL in cancer patients.

2. Emphasize the Importance of Quality of Life (QoL):

- **QoL Relevance:** You have done well to introduce QoL as a key measure in assessing cancer care, but it could be more impactful by directly connecting the importance of QoL assessments to the study's purpose.

3. Review the Evidence on QoL:

- **Balance the Evidence:** The literature review section is solid, but some studies are mentioned without sufficient context or comparison, which might confuse readers about the consensus in the field.

4. Address the Research Gap:

- **Highlight the Research Gap:** The need for further studies on the QoL of Iranian colorectal cancer survivors is mentioned but could be emphasized more strongly to justify the study's purpose.

5. Clarify the Study's Aims and Setting:

- **Study Objective:** The last paragraph introduces your study, but the objective could be stated more clearly to emphasize the study's relevance.

6. Improve Flow and Coherence:

- **Transitions:** Ensure smooth transitions between paragraphs to guide the reader through your narrative logically.

Method

Your methods section is detailed and well-organized, covering key aspects of your study design, population, data collection, and analysis. However, there are some areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity, coherence, and rigor. Below are some suggestions for improvement:

1. Study Design and Setting:

- **Design Description:** While the study design is clearly stated as a "descriptive-correlation design," it might be helpful to briefly explain why this design was chosen and how it is appropriate for your research objectives.
- **Study Setting:** The setting is well-defined, but you could provide more context about the significance of this clinic or its patient population to strengthen the justification for selecting this site.

2. Sample Size and Sampling Method:

- **Sample Size Calculation:** The sample size calculation is mentioned, but it could benefit from a more detailed explanation, especially regarding the assumptions made during the pilot study.
- **Sampling Method:** The use of convenience sampling is noted, but it would be beneficial to justify why this method was chosen and acknowledge any limitations it might introduce.

3. Data Collection:

- **Questionnaire Details:** The description of the QLQ-C30 questionnaire is thorough, but you might consider clarifying how the scoring system aligns with your research objectives.
- **Pilot Testing and Validity:** The process of validating the questionnaire is well-described, but you could further emphasize the reliability of your tools.

4. Ethical Considerations:

- **Informed Consent:** The ethical considerations are well-addressed, but consider briefly discussing how you ensured the consent process was understandable, especially for illiterate participants.

5. Data Analysis:

- **Statistical Tests:** The data analysis section is comprehensive, but the choice of tests could be better justified in terms of their appropriateness for your study's design and objectives.
- **Assumptions and Reporting:** Consider discussing why certain statistical assumptions (e.g., normality, homogeneity of variance) were either met or not reported, as this is often a point of scrutiny in research.

6. Clarity and Precision:

- **Language and Flow:** Ensure that the text is free from minor language issues and that each section flows logically into the next.

7. Limitations and Justifications:

- **Acknowledging Limitations:** It might be beneficial to briefly acknowledge the limitations of your study, particularly in terms of sampling and generalizability, even in the methods section.

Discussion

Your discussion section covers a wide range of important aspects regarding the quality of life (QoL) of GI cancer survivors. It is thorough and draws meaningful comparisons with previous studies, highlighting key predictor factors for QoL. However, there are several areas where the clarity, coherence, and overall impact of your discussion can be improved. Here are some suggestions:

1. Structure and Flow:

- **Improving Coherence:** The discussion could benefit from a more structured approach, where findings are discussed in a logical sequence, with each predictor variable addressed in a separate paragraph. This will help maintain a clear focus and make it easier for readers to follow your arguments.
- **Linking Results to Literature:** While you reference several studies, the integration of these references could be smoother. Instead of simply stating that your results are consistent or inconsistent with previous studies, try to explain why these similarities or differences might exist.

2. Interpretation of Findings:

- **Discussing Clinical Implications:** While you mention the need for supportive care programs, the discussion could delve deeper into what specific interventions could be implemented based on your findings.
- **Exploring the Significance of Findings:** Some findings, such as the impact of marital status or anemia, are mentioned but not fully explored in terms of their broader significance. Discuss how these factors interact with each other and what this means for patient care.

3. Addressing Limitations:

- **Expanding on Limitations:** The limitation regarding patients who sought treatment in private offices is noted, but this could be expanded to include a discussion on how this might have biased your results and what could be done in future studies to address this.

4. Language and Clarity:

- **Improving Language Precision:** Some sentences could be more concise, and the language can be refined for clarity.
- **Avoiding Repetition:** There are instances of repeated ideas (e.g., the discussion of fatigue and its impact on QoL). Streamline these to avoid redundancy.

5. Conclusion and Implications:

- **Strengthening the Conclusion:** The conclusion could be more assertive in terms of the implications of your findings for clinical practice and future research.

- **Application of Findings:** The application of findings is well-conceived, but consider adding more specific recommendations for future research or clinical trials that could build on your results.

- **Strengthening the Conclusion:** The conclusion could be more assertive in terms of the implications of your findings for clinical practice and future research.