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.103647
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(9); e103647

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Lifestyle Modifications Including Dietary and Physical Interventions with Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy on Quality of Life and Cancer-Recurrence Rate among Patients with Breast Cancer and Survivors: A Protocol for a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Elham Razmpoosh, Maryam Mazloom, Maryam Bassiri, Ali Montazeri, Akram Sajadian, Mitra Zarrati, Amin Salehi-Abargoueil

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Apr 2020
Revised Date:	20 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Jul 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) 29 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
there are some comments for the author:
1- Please correct the objectives. in the protocol of systematic review, you must mention primary objectives and secondary objectives in the form of prior because you will perform subgroup analysis according to objectives.
2- Please mention primary and secondary outcomes after objectives.
3- In the protocol, you must explain the eligibility criteria completely, Exactly, and clearly. please mention age range, ethnicity, patients with breast cancer. in the Types of studies, you must mention the type of excluded article and types of blinding in the included studies.
4- In the section of eligibility criteria explain the type of the sampling method and sample

size in the included studies.
5- In the Types of Intervention, you must explain head to head strategy.
6- Usually in the search phase one researcher adequate because with two researchers this work is hard and It will be difficult to reach a consensus.
7- Because the present study is nursing, there must be a database in nursing like the CHINHAL, As a result, you will lose fewer articles. and Please write the search time period.
8- In the section of data management, you mentioned "We will exclude studies if they are animal or in-vitro models. Any records without full texts will also be excluded as well as the studies that are irrelevant to the context." in the statement added in the Eligibility criteria (Types of studies).
9- As it has been written, the dear researcher has not noticed the difference between the two stages of screening and selection.
a) You will not need to repeat the screening step and the title and abstract of the articles will be reviewed.
b) In the selection process, you need to repeat and full-text articles will be reviewed by two or more researchers.
10) Please bring the data management paragraph after the selection and screening process.
11) How to the agreement between the two researchers in the data extraction stage should be mentioned on how to resolve the disagreement between the two researchers.
12) Please explain that you will first check the data extraction as a pilot.
13) In the data synthesis, you explain the subgroup analysis and metaregression.
14) Approach to missing and incomplete data and Quality Analysis not explained.
15) Assessing the possible heterogeneity in the articles was not assessed.
16) In this study, the researcher listed all the components of a protocol, but their order is messy and cluttered. Please make a general review.
17) Please attach the form of quality assessment (risk of bias assessment) of studies.
sincerely

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 May 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript reports the protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis study. The topic is very interesting and the result can quite the practice and further researches. As well, I find the manuscript well written and conceivable, But a few questions should be addressed before publication.
1- Please write the objective of the systematic review on page 6 line 16.
2- I think it is needed to mention the design of the reported study on page 6 under the method section.
3- It is not clear why you search the sources until December 2018. If the study was not performed, please update this time.
4- How you use the articles in different languages.
5- What is the meaning of "The reviewers will finally include records that have mutual concordance within 95%." on page 8 lines 28 and 29.
I wonder the title and subtitle of this manuscript adhere to which reporting guideline.
Best regards

Maryam Rassouli: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting your manuscript in this journal. The topic would be attractive for readers however according to reviewers, there are some concerns regarding the manuscript which should be considered.
Would you revise the manuscript according to all reviewers' comments and submit the revised manuscript within three weeks.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2020

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the above comments and then 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.

Reviewer 1:

1- please correct the objectives. in the protocol of systematic review, you must mention primary objectives and secondary objectives in the form of priori because you will perform subgroup analysis according to objectives.

Answer: Thank you for your comment; it was edited accordingly (Line 108-113)

2- please mention primary and secondary outcomes after objectives.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. According to the PRISMA-P checklist, the order of outcomes and prioritization should be in the “Study Records” section, which is currently correct in the manuscript.

3- In the protocol, you must explain the eligibility criteria completely, exactly, and clearly. Please mention age range, ethnicity, Patients with breast cancer. In the Types of studies, you must mention the type of excluded article and types of blinding in the included studies.

Answer: Thank you very much; related necessary data were added (129-135).

4- in the section of eligibility criteria explain the type of the sampling method and sample size in the included studies.

***Answer**:* Thank you very much; related necessary data were added. (Line 133)

5- in the Types of Intervention, you must explain head to head strategy.

Answer: Thank you very much; related necessary data were added (Line 141-147).

6- usually in the search phase one researcher adequate because with two researchers this work is hard and It will be difficult to reach a consensus.

***Answer**: Thank you very much. We changed it to one researcher (line 153-155).*

7- Because the present study is nursing, there must be a database in nursing like the CHINHAL, As a result, you will lose fewer articles. and Please write the search time period.

***Answer**: thank you very much; it was inserted (Line 154). The time was also added.*

8- in the section of data management, you mentioned "We will exclude studies if they are animal or in-vitro models. Any records without full texts will also be excluded as well as the studies that are irrelevant to the context." in the statement added in the Eligibility criteria (Types of studies).

***Answer**: Thank you very much for your comment; we moved the phrase into the “types of studies”.*

9- As it has been written, the dear researcher has not noticed the difference between the two stages of screening and selection.

***Answer**: Thank you. There are the 2 steps of selection process and data extraction that are explained in detailed in the PRISMA-P guideline, the selection process is Furthermore, according the checklist of PRISMA-P, the titles "selection process" and "data collection" should be mentioned separately. The screening is what is performed in the selection process. In data extraction, information regarding population, ag, stage of disease an the measures of each outcomes will be excluded (explained in detail in line 178-198).*

a) You will not need to repeat the screening step and the title and abstract of the articles will be reviewed.

***Answer**: thank you, it was edited accordingly.*
b) In the selection process, you need to repeat and full-text articles will be reviewed by two or more researchers.

***Answer**: thank you, it was added accordingly (line 185).*

10) Please bring the data management paragraph after the selection and screening process.

***Answer**: thank you very much; the order of every title is what it is written in PRISMA-P checklist.*

11) How to the agreement between the two researchers in the data extraction stage should be mentioned on how to resolve the disagreement between the two researchers.

***Answer**: thank you. The problems will be resolved through rechecking the extracted data and the full texts of articles (line 206).*

12) Please explain that you will first check the data extraction from as a pilot.

***Answer**: thank you, it was added accordingly (line 206).*

13) in the data synthesis, you explain the subgroup analysis and metaregression.

***Answer**: thank you very much; subgroup analysis will be performed based on between-study differences and the phrase was added in line 235. Metaregression is not the preferable method for the present meta-analysis and the design of included articles. It was not written in the manuscript.*

14) Approach to missing and incomplete data and Quality Analysis not explained.

***Answer**: thank you. It was explained accordingly. Line 215-226)*

15) Assessing the possible heterogeneity in the articles was not assessed.

***Answer**: thank you, it was mentioned in line 237-244.*

16) In this study, the researcher listed all the components of a protocol, but their order is messy and cluttered. Please make a general review.

***Answer**: Thank you for your precious comment; the protocol and the order of the titles were written exactly according to the order and titles of PRISMA-P checklist, which is mandatory to be included in the protocols of systematic reviews and meta-analysis. Otherwise, we can change it accordingly.*

17) Please attach the form of quality assessment (risk of bias assessment) of studies.
sincerely

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was attached.*

Reviewer 2:
This manuscript reports the protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis study. The topic is very interesting and the result can quite the practice and further researches. As well, I find the manuscript well written and conceivable, But a few questions should be addressed before publication.

***Answer**: Thank you for your precious comment.*

1-please write the objective of the systematic review on page 6 line 16.

***Answer**: Thank you very much. It was written accordingly. Line 108-113*

2- I think it is needed to mention the design of the reported study on page 6 under the method section.

***Answer**: thank you for your comment; it was mentioned. Line 117.*

3- it is not clear why you search the sources until December 2018. If the study was not performed, please update this time.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was updated accordingly. line 156.*

4- how you use the articles in different languages

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; We translated the full text of articles via translation tools. v*

5- what is the meaning of "The reviewers will finally include records that have mutual concordance within 95%." on page 8 line 28 and 29.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; It means including those articles that all the authors have mutual have mutual concordance on them. However, we omitted the sentence..*

I wonder the title and subtitle of this manuscript adhere to which reporting guideline.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was written completely according to the PRISMA-P checklist, the phrase was written several times in the manuscript. And the checklist was also attached.*

Best regards

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.

Hadis Ashrafizadeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
All the corrections have been applied and the questions have been answered, so the article can be accepted.
Thank you for your attention.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 14 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well-designed and written and the future results will give information on the effect of lifestyle modification on the quality of life of patients with breast cancer; however, according to the "critical appraisal" checklist for systematic reviews, the following comments needed to be answered:
1. Please define the intervention part of PICOS definition, in the right place.
2. What kind of effect sizes will be extracted in case of heterogeneity in the units of outcomes?
3. What aspects of quality of life will be measured?
4. Please mention the significance level of the Cochran Q test for detecting heterogeneity.
5. Due to several measurement tools for measuring QOL, will all kinds of QOL measurements will be included? how will they be assessed?
Thanks

Maryam Rassouli: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 6 Jul 2020

Dear EIC
Thanks to the author for considering the comments of the reviewers' in the first revision of the manuscript. Due to the fact that one of the reviewers asked for some of her comments to be included in the manuscript, I would thank the author to reply to the comments and send the revised manuscript within three weeks.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments.

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.

Reviewer 1:

1. Please define the intervention part of PICOS definition, in the right place.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. It was mentioned accordingly (page 6, line 174).

2. What kind of effect sizes will be extracted in case of heterogeneity in the units of outcomes?

Answer: Thank you very much; standardized mean differences will be extracted (line 207).

3. What aspects of quality of life will be measured?

Answer*:* Thank you very much; general aspect of QOL will be measured (Line 217)

4. Please mention the significance level of Cochran Q test for detecting heterogeneity.
Answer: Thank you very much; it was mentioned (Line 244).

5. Due to several measurement tools for measuring QOL, will all kinds of QOL measurements will be included? how will they be assessed?

Answer*: Thank you very much. Yes they all will be measured and standardized mean differences will be assessed.*

Reviewer 2:
hello dear Editor
All the corrections have been applied and the questions have been answered, so the article can be accepted.
thank you for your attention.

Answer:*:*

Thank you for your comment and your consideration.

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.

Maryam Rassouli: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 17 Jul 2020

Dear Authors
I would like to thank you for considering all comments. According to our reviewers, your manuscript has been accepted for publishing in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 19 Jul 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.

Reviewer 1:

1- please correct the objectives. in the protocol of systematic review, you must mention primary objectives and secondary objectives in the form of priori because you will perform subgroup analysis according to objectives.

Answer: Thank you for your comment; it was edited accordingly (Line 108-113)

2- please mention primary and secondary outcomes after objectives.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. According to the PRISMA-P checklist, the order of outcomes and prioritization should be in the “Study Records” section, which is currently correct in the manuscript.

3- In the protocol, you must explain the eligibility criteria completely, exactly, and clearly. Please mention age range, ethnicity, Patients with breast cancer. In the Types of studies, you must mention the type of excluded article and types of blinding in the included studies.

Answer: Thank you very much; related necessary data were added (129-135).

4- in the section of eligibility criteria explain the type of the sampling method and sample size in the included studies.

***Answer**:* Thank you very much; related necessary data were added. (Line 133)

5- in the Types of Intervention, you must explain head to head strategy.

Answer: Thank you very much; related necessary data were added (Line 141-147).

6- usually in the search phase one researcher adequate because with two researchers this work is hard and It will be difficult to reach a consensus.

***Answer**: Thank you very much. We changed it to one researcher (line 153-155).*

7- Because the present study is nursing, there must be a database in nursing like the CHINHAL, As a result, you will lose fewer articles. and Please write the search time period.

***Answer**: thank you very much; it was inserted (Line 154). The time was also added.*

8- in the section of data management, you mentioned "We will exclude studies if they are animal or in-vitro models. Any records without full texts will also be excluded as well as the studies that are irrelevant to the context." in the statement added in the Eligibility criteria (Types of studies).

***Answer**: Thank you very much for your comment; we moved the phrase into the “types of studies”.*

9- As it has been written, the dear researcher has not noticed the difference between the two stages of screening and selection.

***Answer**: Thank you. There are the 2 steps of selection process and data extraction that are explained in detailed in the PRISMA-P guideline, the selection process is Furthermore, according the checklist of PRISMA-P, the titles "selection process" and "data collection" should be mentioned separately. The screening is what is performed in the selection process. In data extraction, information regarding population, ag, stage of disease an the measures of each outcomes will be excluded (explained in detail in line 178-198).*

a) You will not need to repeat the screening step and the title and abstract of the articles will be reviewed.

***Answer**: thank you, it was edited accordingly.*
b) In the selection process, you need to repeat and full-text articles will be reviewed by two or more researchers.

***Answer**: thank you, it was added accordingly (line 185).*

10) Please bring the data management paragraph after the selection and screening process.

***Answer**: thank you very much; the order of every title is what it is written in PRISMA-P checklist.*

11) How to the agreement between the two researchers in the data extraction stage should be mentioned on how to resolve the disagreement between the two researchers.

***Answer**: thank you. The problems will be resolved through rechecking the extracted data and the full texts of articles (line 206).*

12) Please explain that you will first check the data extraction from as a pilot.

***Answer**: thank you, it was added accordingly (line 206).*

13) in the data synthesis, you explain the subgroup analysis and metaregression.

***Answer**: thank you very much; subgroup analysis will be performed based on between-study differences and the phrase was added in line 235. Metaregression is not the preferable method for the present meta-analysis and the design of included articles. It was not written in the manuscript.*

14) Approach to missing and incomplete data and Quality Analysis not explained.

***Answer**: thank you. It was explained accordingly. Line 215-226)*

15) Assessing the possible heterogeneity in the articles was not assessed.

***Answer**: thank you, it was mentioned in line 237-244.*

16) In this study, the researcher listed all the components of a protocol, but their order is messy and cluttered. Please make a general review.

***Answer**: Thank you for your precious comment; the protocol and the order of the titles were written exactly according to the order and titles of PRISMA-P checklist, which is mandatory to be included in the protocols of systematic reviews and meta-analysis. Otherwise, we can change it accordingly.*

17) Please attach the form of quality assessment (risk of bias assessment) of studies.
sincerely

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was attached.*

Reviewer 2:
This manuscript reports the protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis study. The topic is very interesting and the result can quite the practice and further researches. As well, I find the manuscript well written and conceivable, But a few questions should be addressed before publication.

***Answer**: Thank you for your precious comment.*

1-please write the objective of the systematic review on page 6 line 16.

***Answer**: Thank you very much. It was written accordingly. Line 108-113*

2- I think it is needed to mention the design of the reported study on page 6 under the method section.

***Answer**: thank you for your comment; it was mentioned. Line 117.*

3- it is not clear why you search the sources until December 2018. If the study was not performed, please update this time.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was updated accordingly. line 156.*

4- how you use the articles in different languages

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; We translated the full text of articles via translation tools. v*

5- what is the meaning of "The reviewers will finally include records that have mutual concordance within 95%." on page 8 line 28 and 29.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; It means including those articles that all the authors have mutual have mutual concordance on them. However, we omitted the sentence..*

I wonder the title and subtitle of this manuscript adhere to which reporting guideline.

***Answer**: Thank you for your comment; it was written completely according to the PRISMA-P checklist, the phrase was written several times in the manuscript. And the checklist was also attached.*

Best regards

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) 21 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.