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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.101608
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(7); e101608

Peer Review Report for "Metacognitive Beliefs, Positive States of Mind, and Emotional Approach Coping as the Predictors of Medical Compliance in Patients with Cancer"

Author(s): Soodabeh Bassak Nejad, Asieyeh Kargar, Najmeh Hamid, Sassan Razmjoo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 9 May 2020
Accepted Date: 14 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

27 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
There are some comments to the author:
Title
- In the title, “Evaluation of,” delete and Treatment compliance change to “Medical compliance”. The same term should be used in all texts.
Abstract
- Describe the data analysis at the Methodology.
- In the results section, state the most important research findings statistically.
Introduction
- In general, the introduction is not coherent and its writing needs to correction. In the introduction, does not clear problem statement and the relationships between the variables are not well explained. Research innovation is not well expressed. - Please rewrite this section.
Methodology
- In the entrance criteria, the diagnosis of breast cancer is correct.
- State the code of ethics

- Explain the ethical principles and if participants completed satisfaction form.
- The report of questioners must be accurate.
- There are four variables in this study. All of them needed to report instrument.

Findings

- In addition to demographic information, provide more information about disease variables, such as stage of cancer.

Conclusion

- This part is not very structured. The first paragraph is dedicated to the purpose and reporting of results. Explanatory are needed based on theory after that. Then, compare the findings (of present study) with other research findings. Provide appropriate explanations for your findings and arrange for clinical suggestions based on results.
- Also, the conclusion is not well stated: "My variables are the best!" indicating pride.it is not suitable for a researcher.
- Finally, state the limitations and research suggestions.
- Adjust resources according to Vancouver format.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 28 Apr 2020

Dear Author,

Please consider the comments of associate editor in your manuscript and resubmit.

Thanks.

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.

Dear editor of International J of cancer Management

I am soodabeh Bassak Nejad, associate professor of psychology and Corresponding Author of this paper" Metacognitive Beliefs, Positive States of Mind, and Emotional Approach Coping as Predictors of Cancer Patients' Medical compliance". I correct paper and I explain :some of correction of it

Title
In the title, "Evaluation of," delete and Treatment compliance change to "Medical .compliance". The same term should be used in all texts
.In all paper change the term of medical compliance and modify the title 1

Abstract
Describe the data analysis at the Methodology.
In the results section, state the most important research findings statistically.
2 Abstract change and required items were added in abstract.

Introduction
In general, the introduction is not coherent and its writing needs to correction. In the introduction, does not clear problem statement and the relationships between the variables are not well explained. Research innovation is not well expressed. Please rewrite this section.
3 I correct this section and rewrite some statements were not coherent. So I prefer to add some statements could clear this section.

Methodology
In the entrance criteria, the diagnosis of breast cancer is correct.
State the code of ethics
Explain the ethical principles and if participants completed satisfaction form.
The report of questioners must be accurate.
There are four variables in this study. All of them needed to report instrument.
4 this section changed and added the ethical principles.

5 Kind of Likert responses, validity and reliability added to psychological instrument.

Findings
In addition to demographic information, provide more information about disease variables, such as stage of cancer.
6 we did not consider cancer stage but type of treatment added to table

Conclusion
This part is not very structured. The first paragraph is dedicated to the purpose and reporting of results. Explanatory are needed based on theory after that. Then, compare the findings (of present study) with other research findings. Provide appropriate explanations for your findings and arrange for clinical suggestions based on results.
Also, the conclusion is not well stated: "My variables are the best!" indicating pride.it is not suitable for a researcher.
7 In conclusion we try hard to write clear conclusion. In psychological paper hard to explain

and find clear statements for complex construct like a metacognition (English language or even farsi).

Finally, state the limitations and research suggestions.
Adjust resources according to Vancouver format.

8 we added limitations and future suggestion and modify references

I hope consider this changes and The answer was satisfactory.

Soodabeh Bassak Nejad

Associate Professor of Psychology

Shahid Chamran University Of Ahvaz

Ahvaz-Iran

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 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) 14 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
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.