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

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.101371
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(11); e101371

Peer Review Report for "The Predictive Role of Body Image and Sexual Function in Quality of Life After Modified Radical Mastectomy Regarding the Mediating Role of Emotion; A Cross Sectional Study"

Author(s): Bijan Pirnia, Nasrin Homayounfar , Nasim Hosseini, Farshid Ebrahimi, Zahra Haj Sadeghi, Parastoo Malekanmehr

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	1 Feb 2020
Revised Date:	27 May 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Jun 2020

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

16 May 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript is interesting but there are several mistakes in the writing of the manuscript. It needs minor revision. There is some point by point recommendation for the authors that may help the improvement of the quality of the manuscript:
- Please mention to the design of study in the initial of the title.
- The abstract on the journal policy should be with structure.
- In the introduction section please refer to research necessity, In this study what does the benefit compare to previous studies?
- Please explain the respondent-driven sampling method.
- The level of significance, and its version should be mentioned in the methods of the abstract.
- Please refer to Method of sample size estimate.

- The level of significance should be mentioned in the methods of abstract.
- It would better that the authors used the “Mesh keyword, the keywords are not Mesh.
- An introduction section, first, the prevalence of diabetes in the word and finally please refer to prevalence in the Iran.

Methods section:

- Why were women are chosen, not men in this study?
- What are the criteria for the diagnosis of BC?
- Please mention the ethical code of your study in method section.

Results:

- Please mention to the assumptions for statistical tests in the initial of result section.
- The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test should be mention with p-value.
- Please mention the ethical considerations of your study.

Discussion:

- The discussion needs adding the references in the text.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 20 May 2020

Dear author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the comments of associate editor and then resubmit.

Thank you

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.

Reviewers' Comments: **Responses to reviewers:**

Reviewer 1:

This manuscript is interesting but there are several mistakes in the writing of the manuscript. It needs minor revision. There is some point by point recommendation that may help the improvement of the quality of the manuscript:

Please mention to the design of study in the initial of the title.

Was reformed to:

A cross sectional study to assess the predictive role of body image and sexual function in quality of life after modified radical mastectomy, the mediating role of difficulty in emotion regulation

The abstract on the journal policy should be with structure.

Was reformed.

In introduction section please refer to research necessity, this study what dose benefit compare to previous studies?

Knowing the important factors in the body image, QOL, sexual function and emotion regulation can facilitate the process of improving the survivors of breast cancer. Despite the increasing growth of studies about physical and psychological components, the interaction of these indices has not been studied.

Please explain the respondent-driven sampling method.

RDS is a combination of chain sampling and a mathematical model (Markov chain theory and network bias).

The level of significance, and its version should be mentioned in the methods of abstract.

Software version 22 and the significance criterion was considered as 0.05.

Please refer to Method of sample size estimate.

Sample size (n = 90) was estimated based on the allocation of 5 subjects per each parameter.

The level of significance should be mentioned in the methods of abstract.
Significance criterion was considered as 0.05.

It would better that the authors used “Mesh keyword, the keywords are not Mesh.

Whole keyword including Modified radical mastectomy, Body Image, Sexual behavior, Emotions and Quality of life was selected based on the Mesh keyword.

In introduction section, first, the prevalence of breast cancer in the word and finally please refer to prevalence in the Iran.

The incidence of BC in women was 22 per 100,000.

Methods section:

Why were women chosen, not men in this study?
As indicated, the incidence of BC in women was 22 per 100,000. Also, easier access to women with mastectomy than men.

What is the criteria for the diagnosis of BC?
Based on the 11th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11).

Please mention the ethical code of your study in method section.
This study was registered at the Thai Clinical Trials Registry (http://www.clinicaltrials.in.th) with the TCTR ID: TCTR20190412003.

Results:
Please mention to the assumptions for statistical test in initial of result section.
The assumptions of the parametric tests were examined before the selection of the statistical test. The results of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K-S) test showed that the distribution of the scores of the participants in the research in all three studied variables was normal ($p > 0.05$). The assumption n of the linearity of the

relationship between the variables was also examined by the analysis of variance and the presupposition was confirmed ($p < 0.01$).

The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test should be mention with p value.
The results of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (K-S) test showed that the distribution of the scores of the participants in the research in all three studied variables was normal ($p > 0.05$).

Please mention the ethical considerations of your study.
This study was registered at the Thai Clinical Trials Registry (http://www.clinicaltrials.in.th) with the TCTR ID: TCTR20190412003. All stages of the study were carried out after obtaining informed consent from the participants and based on the Declaration of Helsinki (DoH).

Discussion:
The discussion needs adding the references in the text.
In total, ten study was added:
On the other hand, the research background shows that cancer treatment (Surgery, Radiotherapy, and Systematic Treatment Selection) can be associated with physical and psychological consequences (3, 5-8).
Sample size (n = 90) was estimated based on the allocation of 5 subjects per each parameter (19).
Structured Clinical Interview (SCID): It is a Clinical Interview that is used to diagnose dysfunctions of axis 1 based on DSM-5 (21).
The results study of Darwish et al. (15) showed that Egyptian breast cancer survivors reported lower overall global QOL. Also, the results study of Munshi et al. (27) showed that patients with breast conservation surgery (BCS) had better sexual enjoyment and future perspective scores compared with mastectomy patients.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 6 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
This is my pleasure to announce you that your article has been accepted by the editorial committee after peer review in the International Journal of Cancer Management (IJCM). Hopefully, it will be published in future issues.
Thanks