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.102195
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(7); e102195

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Reflexology in Treating Cancer Pain: A Meta-Analysis"

Author(s): Zhila Najafpour, Kamran Shayanfard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 20 May 2020
Accepted Date: 23 May 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mohammadreza Mobinizadeh: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 30 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
1) The author should add inclusion criteria in the method section of the abstract.
2) what is the effectiveness indicator in this research? it should be elaborated more in the abstract and main body.
3) how to use the "random effect model" for meta-analysis? the reason should be elaborated more.
4) in the result section, "Quality assessment: should be moved after "Selection of eligible studies".
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 7 Apr 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) — 7 Apr 2020

Dear Author,

Please consider the comments of the reviewer 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.

Answer to referee's comments

Question: *please add inclusion criteria in the method section of abstract.*

Answer: *It added.*

Question: *what is effectiveness indicator in this research? It should be elaborated more in the abstract and main body.*
Answer: *it added. Cancer pain was our outcome and obviously we reported SMD for the indicator by Meta-analysis.*

Question: *how to use "random effect model" for Meta - analysis? The reason should be elaborated more.*

Answer: *Since included studies came from different settings and background, we performed a random effect model. We added this explanation in the methods section.*

Question: *in the result section, "Quality assessment: should be moved after "Selection of eligible studies"*

Answer: *it moved.*

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 28 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
It seems that your article is a systematic review article so you have selected a wrong article type for your manuscript. for more information, please visit the following link.
http://intjcancermanag.com/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#systematic_review.html
Thanks.

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.

Answer to referee's comments

Question: It seems that your article is a systematic review article so you have selected a wrong article type for your manuscript. for more information, please visit the following link.

Answer: It edited based on systematic review structure in the journal

Question: *please add inclusion criteria in the method section of abstract.*

Answer: *It added.*

Question: *what is effectiveness indicator in this research? It should be elaborated more in the abstract and main body.*
Answer: *it added. Cancer pain was our outcome and obviously we reported SMD for the indicator by Meta-analysis.*

Question: *how to use "random effect model" for Meta - analysis? The reason should be elaborated more.*

Answer: *Since included studies came from different settings and background, we performed a random effect model. We added this explanation in the methods section.*

Question: *in the result section, "Quality assessment: should be moved after "Selection of eligible studies"*

Answer: *it moved.*

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 4 May 2020

Dear AE,
In my idea, my comments totally was performed by authors.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 13 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised in a well-liked format base on the previous comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 16 May 2020

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in the authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from the ORCID website at https://orcid.org.
Thank you.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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.

EIC Decision:

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org. Thank you.

- *It added.*

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 20 May 2020

Dear Author,
It is necessary to add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors, you should add it in the submission process in authors section.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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.

EIC Decision:

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org. Thank you.

I try to add it in the author section but the journal site not allowed for saving the changes.
Please guidance me.
Regards
Dr. zhila Najafpour my ORCID : 0000-0003-0258-8015

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 23 May 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.