OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope-121702
Published in: Health Scope: 11(3); e121702

Peer Review Report for "Concerns About Breast Pain: How Useful Is Imaging?"

Author(s): Salome Nwaelom Ezeofor, Nneka Ifeyinwa Iloanusi, Philip Chinedu Okere

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Dec 2021
Revised Date: 7 Jun 2022
Accepted Date: 9 Jun 2022

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Hedayat Salari: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 22 Dec 2021

ID: 121702, Concerns About Breast Pain: How Useful is Imaging?
Hello
In my opinion, this research is related to the field of examining the appropriateness of diagnostic prescriptions, which is one of the main concerns of health policymakers in the world. From a methodological point of view, my opinion is that first the indications for breast mammography were extracted from valid global guidelines. Then, the study samples were matched with these indications and the appropriateness of the prescriptions was judged. But this research has been done with the methodology of the authors themselves. However, this is important and practical research that is publishable. My methodological comment is suggested for further research by the authors.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Dec 2021

Abstract: method: describe the study design. How data were gathered? Briefly write about the study population and sampling method.
Briefly state if the relationship between the variables has been examined
Method: The procedure is very concise. Give a detailed description of the procedure, how the data is collected, and the tools used.

Write about Ethical considerations and Patient Informed Form.:
Describe the Grant number, Project no, and Authors contribution.
Design Tables according to the standards.
It is recommended to reduce the volume of tables and graphs.
Use the following papers to improve the quality of the manuscript:
1. Prevalence of Depression Among Iranian Women with Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis
2. The Effect of Exercise Type on Inflammatory Markers in Obese Survivors With Breast Cancer: Randomized Control Trial

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Dec 2021

Dear Editor,
The manuscript needs Minor Revision.
Best,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2021

Dear author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

CONCERNS ABOUT BREAST PAIN: HOW USEFUL IS IMAGING?
Reply to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes are done on the page number and line number
2	*In tables, all words are capitalized. Please make sure the first letter of each word is capitalized.*	Done.	From Page 16 Line 1 to page 18 Line 3.
	Reduce the number of shapes if possible.	I could not reduce the number of figures considering that this is a paper based on 'imaging.'	
	Figures are not cited in the text of the article in the findings section. Please note.	I don't understand. Should I cite the figures in the results section? I cited them in the discussion (Figures 1 to 7).	Page 9, Line 3-11.
	In the previous round of review, it was stated that the following articles should be used; however, this comment was not done. Kindly, use the following articles in the introduction and discussion sections and cite them in the references section: *1. The Effect of Exercise Type on Inflammatory Markers in Obese Survivors with Breast Cancer: Randomized Control Trial.* *2. Prevalence of Depression Among Iranian Women with Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.*	The suggested publications were used as references 17 and 19, respectively, in the introduction section. The 1st article did not fit the discussion section.	Page 4, Line 21, in the introduction. Page 13, Lines 20-22, and Page 14 lines 3-5, in the reference section.
	Write a caption for each Figure.	Done on the submission portal.	Captions were added while uploading images.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 15 Apr 2022

Dear Authors,
Kindly attention to the following comments:
-In the previous round of review, it was stated that the following articles should be used; however, this comment was not done. Kindly, use the following articles in the introduction and discussion sections and cite them in the references section.
• In tables all words are capitalized. Please make sure the first letter of each word is capitalized.
• Reduce the number of shapes if possible.
• Figures are not cited in the text of the article in the findings section. Please note.

Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 15 Apr 2022

Dear Editor,
The manuscript entitled: Concerns About Breast Pain: How Useful is Imaging? need Minor Revision.
Regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision (1)** 18 Apr 2022

Dear author
According to reviewer comments, the manuscript needs "Minor Revision".
Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

CONCERNS ABOUT BREAST PAIN: HOW USEFUL IS IMAGING?

Reply to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes are done on the page number and line number
2	*Abstract: method: describe the study design. How were data gathered? Briefly write about the study population and sampling method.*	Done.	Page 1, lines 8 to 17.
	Briefly state if the relationship between the variables has been examined	Yes. Inferential statistics- Chi-Square.	Page 1, lines 15 to 17.
	Method: The procedure is very concise. Give a detailed description of the procedure, how the data is collected, and the tools used.	We have added details on how the images and reports were generated before the retrospective study. We also included information on tools from which data was culled- sonomammography questionnaire, ultrasound, and mammography images.	Page 6, line 1 to page 7, line 3.
	Write about Ethical considerations and Patient Informed Form.:	Ethical approval was sought from the hospital research ethics committee. The mammography/sonomammography questionnaire doubles as a consent form because the patient usually signs to consent to have a clinical breast exam and imaging performed on her.	This is explained in the methodology section on Page 5, lines 20 to page 6, line 3.
	Describe Grant number, Project no.	This study is retrospective and was not covered by a grant.	
	Authors contribution.	**AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**: Dr. Salome Ezeofor contributed to the conception and study design, data collection, data analysis, drafting of the manuscript, and final approval of the	

		manuscript. Prof Philip Okere contributed to the conception and design of the study, manuscript revision, and final approval of the manuscript. Dr. Nneka Iloanusi contributed to data collection, and drafting of the methodology section, and participated in critical manuscript revision and final approval of the manuscript.	
	Design tables according to the standards. *It is recommended to reduce the volume of tables and graphs.*	One table has been removed and the others edited for easier comprehension. There are now a total of 3 tables.	Pages 16-18
	Use the following papers to improve the quality of the manuscript: *1. Prevalence of Depression Among Iranian Women with Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.* *2. The Effect of Exercise Type on Inflammatory Markers in Obese Survivors with Breast Cancer: Randomized Control Trial.*	The suggested publications were used to adjust the presentation of the methodology, results, and conclusions in the abstract section.	Abstract: Page 1.
	A brief title should be written for each Figure.	Done and uploaded.	
	In your main word file (of your manuscript), all revised parts must be Highlighted. **2)** Please do not use the **Commenting and Track Change** tools of Microsoft Office Word. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.	Corrected according to journal instructions.	

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Mohammad Khammarnia: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 9 Jun 2022

Dear Authors,
In the third review round, the manuscript corrections are well done. At this stage, it can be published in the journal.
Best,

Mohammad Khammarnia: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 9 Jun 2022

Dear Editor,
The manuscript entitled "Concerns About Breast Pain: How Useful is Imaging?" has been revised based on the reviewer's comments. My decision is Acceptance.
Sincerely,

Ramazan Mirzaei: EIC | **Revision** (2) 9 Jun 2022

Dear Author
According to reviewer comments, we congratulate to inform you that your article has been accepted for publication in this journal and we thank you for trusting us. As an expert in the field, you are best placed to explain why your article is exciting or impactful to a broader so if you fulfill your other commitments in a timely manner, your article will be published in this journal at the appointed time.
Kind regards