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.104870
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(10); e104870

Peer Review Report for "Mothers' Attitudes toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer"

Author(s): Atena Dadgari, Imane Bagheri, Naiire Salmani, Mahnaz Mirakhor

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 May 2020
Revised Date:	19 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	20 Aug 2020

Revision (0)

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** (0) 13 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Thanks to the author for submitting the manuscript to this journal. It is written about an important subject in pediatric oncology however there are some concerns regarding the manuscript as follows:
- The manuscript should be revised by native language editor.
- Instead of "function", it is recommended to use "performance".
- It is suggested that the body of the manuscript divided to more paragraphs.
- It is recommended to focus on statistics of childhood cancers in Iran where the study has been conducted.
- It is suggested to delete the different types of CAM which are provided in page 3.
- Some parts of introduction are not relevant and should be deleted including 8 last lines of the last paragraph in page 3.
- It is not clear what the problem is. In what extent parents uses TCM for their ill children including children with cancer. Is there any references which indicate the consequences of using TCM in children with cancer especially in Iran? What about Iranian believes regarding using such remedies?
Methods
- What is the meaning of "main protector" as an inclusion criterion in page 4?

- Characteristics like stage of disease or duration of suffering cannot be considered as “demographics”. Please name them as “clinical characteristics/conditions”.
- It is recommended to describe the process of developing the survey. How items were extracted?
- Who were experts who confirmed the content validity of the instrument? What were their expertise?
- According to the instrument and its different section, some parts like using and reasons for using TCM can be considered as mothers’ performance regarding use of TCM and parts like its advantages or side effects are not related to their performance.
- How was face validity assessed? Who were participants for conducting face validity? How did they do that?
- Please report ICC instead of Spearman correlation coefficient for reliability of the instrument.
- It is suggested to describe the method of gathering data. Where did researchers find mothers? Were their children hospitalized or they referred to the clinic?
- What were ethical considerations? Please mention the ethics code.

Results

- Please insert all demographics and clinical characteristics in table 1 and delete related content from the body of the manuscript.

Discussion

- This section needs an essential revision.
- It is recommended to start the section with a brief introduction (maximum two lines) followed by the aim of the study.
- The last sentence of the third paragraph in page 7, needs reference.
- In discussion section, researchers just payed attention to similarities and differences between the results of this research with others however there is nothing about the reasons for this congruence or controversy. It is recommended to interpret and explain the results.
- For enriching discussion section, it is suggested to compare some aspects of using TCM with general information regarding the topic in Iran including most frequently used products in general population or reasons for using them.
- What are limitations of the study?

Conclusion

- Please revise this section according to all results.

Would the author consider the mentioned comments as well as the reviewer's comments (attached file) and submit the revised manuscript within next three weeks.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments.
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.

It is suggested that the body of the manuscript divided to more paragraphs.

manuscript divided to more paragraphs

It is recommended to focus on statistics of childhood cancers in Iran where the study has been conducted.

statistics of childhood cancers in Iran added.

It is suggested to delete the different types of CAM which are provided in page 3.

the different types of CAM deleted.

Some parts of introduction are not relevant and should be deleted including 8 last lines of the last paragraph in page 3.

8 last lines of the last paragraph in page 3 deleted.

It is not clear what the problem is. In what extent parents uses TCM for their ill children including children with cancer. Is there any references which indicate the consequences of using TCM in children with cancer especially in Iran? What about Iranian believes regarding using such remedies?

one paragraph added

Methods
What is the meaning of “main protector” as an inclusion criterion in page 4?

Inclusion criteria consist of: being a mother.

Characteristics like stage of disease or duration of suffering cannot be considered as “demographics”. Please name them as “clinical characteristics/conditions”.

This sentences added : Data collection instruments in this study are: demographic questionnaire (child age, child sex, mother's age, mother's education, mother's occupation, economic status and being local), clinical condition questionnaire (type of disease, duration, type of treatments,

number of hospitalizations, disease relapse) and a researcher made questionnaire to investigate mother's use in relationship with complementary and alternative medicine.

It is recommended to describe the process of developing the survey. How items were extracted?

This sentences added :The items on the six-part questionnaire on mothers use of complementary and alternative medicine use for their child with cancer were extracted from a literature review .

Who were experts who confirmed the content validity of the instrument? What were their expertise?

This sentences added : To investigate the questionnaire face and content validity, ten experts (Ph.D. professors of nursing (n=6), oncologist doctors (n=2) and nurse of Oncology Department (n=2)) provided feedback on the level of difficulty, incompatibility, ambiguity of expressions, or insufficiency in word meanings. Their comments were applied as minor changes to the questionnaire.

According to the instrument and its different section, some parts like using and reasons for using TCM can be considered as mothers' performance regarding use of TCM and parts like its advantages or side effects are not related to their performance.How was face validity assessed? Who were participants for conducting face validity? How did they do that?Please report ICC instead of Spearman correlation coefficient for reliability of the instrument.

This sentences added:To investigate reliability, the test-retest method was used. Ten mothers meeting the inclusion criteria completed the questionnaires for the study, and then one week later. Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) calculated as 0.80 between these two times. Test-retest reliability of the questionnaire was therefore evaluated as adequate.

It is suggested to describe the method of gathering data. Where did researchers find mothers? Were their children hospitalized or they referred to the clinic?

This sentences added :The researcher went to the pediatric oncology department and the mothers who had a child with cancer in the ward were asked to participate in the study if they met the criteria.

What were ethical considerations? Please mention the ethics code.

This sentences added : IR.SSU.MEDICINE.REC.1397.164 ethical code.

Results

Please insert all demographics and clinical characteristics in table 1 and delete related content from the body of the manuscript.

yes, i did .

Discussion
It is recommended to start the section with a brief introduction (maximum two lines) followed by the aim of the study.

This sentences added : Interest in Complementary and Alternative Medicine applications is growing globally, particularly for cancer patients. This study aimed to determine the mothers' use regarding the use of complementary and alternative medicine for children with cancer.

The last sentence of the third paragraph in page 7, needs reference.

reference added.

In discussion section, researchers just payed attention to similarities and differences between the results of this research with others however there is nothing about the reasons for this congruence or controversy. It is recommended to interpret and explain the results.

This sentences added : may be due to different cultural backgrounds (12). In Iran, the high use of plant materials can be due to people's satisfaction with the effects of these substances, the availability of herbal medicine companies, the ease of use of herbal products, the breadth of information on herbal products and ultimately influenced by the country's policy. Iran, for economic reasons and reduced dependence, has encouraged people to start using herbal products. (26)

For enriching discussion section, it is suggested to compare some aspects of using TCM with general information regarding the topic in Iran including most frequently used products in general population or reasons for using them.

This sentences added :

The use of homeopathy has never been mentioned, possibly because different methods of complementary and alternative medicine are unknown in the cultural-social background of the present Iranian society.

Differences in the selection of CAM may be influenced by local, national and academic level diversities . Other factors such as harmfulness, expensiveness, unpopularity and ineffectiveness of complementary and alternative medicine methods may influence the selection of these methods .

Parents may avoid counseling about this problem because physicians may be pessimistic about complementary and alternative medicine and they are worried what the physician's answer will be. It is important that physicians always provide an atmosphere for talking to motivate parents to ask and answer about complementary and alternative medicine and to receive physicians' opinions .

The study had limitations such as the method of available sampling, the location of the sampling (an oncology center), use of a previously untested research-developed self-report questionnaire, and the possibility of bias from reminders embedded in the questions about the use of complementary and alternative medicine methods.

What are limitations of the study?

This sentences added :

The study had limitations such as the method of available sampling, the location of the sampling (an oncology center), use of a previously untested research-developed self-report questionnaire, and the possibility of bias from reminders embedded in the questions about the use of complementary and alternative medicine methods.

Conclusion

Please revise this section according to all results

yes, i did .

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) 5 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Abstract
- It is better to change the type of study to cross-sectional research.
- In the methodology section, simple sentences should be stated and statistical methods should be named. Write about the scale scoring and the reliability and validity of the scale. The word of researcher-made is ambiguous.
- The numbers in parentheses can be removed in the findings section. And list the demographic of the participants.
Method
- What is Scale Scoring?
- Is the tool available to all people and 150 people of them complete the survey? or study? please write in detail
- The author said in the abstract " 83.34% of mothers used prayers " and said in the results " 16.66% (n=25) used only prayers and 83.34% (n=125) mentioned other ways besides 144 prayers ", Please match these two sentences.
- Is there a relationship between demographic variables and questionnaire items?
- In Exclusion criteria, the mother's refusal to participate in the study is not correct. Having the consent to enter the study is one of the inclusion criteria.
- Are the history of cancer of other family members included in the inclusion and exclusion criteria?
- In terms of the mother's job, free what does it mean?
- In the case of side effects of CAM in the scale, should be considered another option.
Thanks.

Maryam Rassouli: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for considering all reviewer's comments and submitted the revised manuscript. I would like to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in one of our future issues of the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 11 Aug 2020

Dear Authors,

Thank you for revising your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. There are still some points that need consideration:

1. In the title of the manuscript, "Mothers' Use regarding the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine for Children with Cancer" is meaningless. You can replace it with "Mothers' attitude toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer".

2. In the keywords section, "complementary and alternative medicine" is not a MeSH heading. "children" is not a MeSH heading, the appropriate MeSH heading is "child". "cancer" is not a MeSH heading, the appropriate MeSH heading is "Neoplasms". You should provide at least 3 keywords, selected from MeSH heading terms.

3. All abbreviations used in each table, should be defined below that table, such as CAM in table 2.

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:
Title
Modify the title : Mothers' Use regarding the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine for Children with Cancer

EIC Decision:

1. In the title of the manuscript, "Mothers' Use regarding the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine for Children with Cancer" is meaningless. You can replace it with "Mothers' attitude toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer".

response: Mothers' attitude toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer" use for title

Abstract
It is better to change the type of study to cross sectional research.

***response : cross sectional research* replaced**

In the methodology section, simple sentences should be stated and statistical methods should be named. Write about the scale scoring ,and the reliability and validity of the scale. The word of researcher-made is ambiguous.

response : statistical methods named and we did not scoring in questionnaire, reliability and validity of the scale* added. *researcher-made word deleted.

The numbers in parentheses can be removed in the findings section.And list the demographic of the participants.

response : numbers in parentheses removed

Method
What is Scale Scoring?

response : we did not scoring in questionnaire.

Is the tool available to all people and 150 people of them complete the survey? or study? please write in detail?

***response* : Nonrandom and convenience sampling started from January 5th, 2018 to January 5th, 2019, and the number of samples estimated 150 individuals according to the study of Bordbar and his colleagues (24).**

You said in the abstract " 83.34% of mothers used prayers " and said in the results " 16.66% (n=25) used only prayers and 83.34% (n=125) mentioned other ways besides prayers " , Please match these two sentences.

***response* :These sentences are not contradictory.25 people only prayed and did not use any other method.125 people both used prayer and used another method besides prayer.**

Is there a relationship between demographic variables and questionnaire items?

response :no

In Exclusion criteria, mother's refusal to participate in the study is not correct. Having the consent to enter the study is one of the inclusion criteria.

response* : mother's satisfaction for participating in the study *added to inclusion criteria

Are the history of cancer of other family members included in the inclusion and exclusion criteria?

response :no

In terms of the mother's job, free what does it mean?

***response* :self-employment replaced**

In the case of side effect of CAM in the scale, should be considered another option.

response :CAM: Complementary and Alternative Medicine added

EIC Decision:

Dear authors,
Thank you for revising your manuscript according to the reviewers' comment. There are still some points that need consideration:
1. In the title of the manuscript, "Mothers' Use regarding the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine for Children with Cancer" is meaningless. You can replace it with "Mothers' attitude toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer".

response : "Mothers' attitude toward the Use of Complementary and Alternative Medicine in Children with Cancer".replaced

2. In the keywords section, "complementary and alternative medicine" is not a MeSH heading. "children" is not a MeSH heading, the appropriate MeSH heading is "child". "cancer" is not a MeSH heading, the appropriate MeSH heading is "Neoplasms". You should provide at least 3 keywords, selected from MeSH heading terms.

response :* Complementary Therapies, child, *Neoplasms replaced

3. All abbreviations used in each table, should be defined bellow that table, such as CAM in table 2.

response :CAM: Complementary and Alternative Medicine added

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 20 Aug 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.