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 "**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:

Peer Review

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/ijcm.116346
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 15(2) ; e116346

Peer Review Report for "Effectiveness of Training Workshop on ICD-10 Cancer Coding Guidelines for Clinical Coders"

Author(s): Farkhondeh Asadi, Maryam Ahmadi Hosseini, Tahere Gomar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 May 2021
Revised Date:	15 Oct 2021
Accepted Date:	28 Dec 2021

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

1 Oct 2021

Dear AE:
Comment[1]: In Abstract Line 24, the keywords must be written based on MeSH, e.g., 'clinical coding' instead of 'clinical coder'.
Comment[2]: In Introduction Line 64, the ICD-10 abbreviation should be defined.
Comment[3]: In Method Line 117, report the value of Cronbach's alpha.
Comment[4]: In Method Line 121, report reliability.
Comment[5]: In Results, report the results of Table 3 within the text and remove the table.
Comment[6]: Discussion should be expanded and Conclusion should be added at the end.

Comment[7]: In the reference list, a link and date of access should be added to References 14, 23, and 37. References 4, 8, 10, 19, and 34 should be corrected.

REFEREE : Reviewer

3 Oct 2021

To AE:

1. Some references need to be edited, such as numbers: 2,8, and 11
2. Please write the keywords according to MeSH.
3. In the methods:

please mention if they applied all the levels of the Patrick model.

For the first time of using ICD-10, please mention the complete form of its name.

Please mention the amount of reliability.

4. In the section of results:

Please remove Table 3 and report its content in the text with suitable sentences.

5. In the Discussion section:

Please clarify this part more and explain the effects of the quality of coding in cancer registry applications.

6. Please explain the Ethical considerations of your study.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

4 Oct 2021

To EIC,

Regarding the reviewers' comments, this manuscript needs revision.

REFEREE : EIC

4 Oct 2021

Dear author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers and 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.

Author's Response to Reviewers' Comments

Dear Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

I would like to thank the reviewers for careful reviewing of this manuscript entitled "Evaluating the effect of an in-service training workshop on ICD-10 cancer coding Instructions for Clinical Coders" (manuscript ID: 116346) and for their valuable comments, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript.

We have applied all comments in the revised version and have modified the paper accordingly. The textual changes have been highlighted in the manuscript .Below, these modifications are given in detail.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

comment 1. Some references need to be edited such as numbers: 2,8, and 11

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on pages :12-17.

comment 2. Please write the key words according to MeSH.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page: 1.

comment 3. In the methods:
please mention if you applied all the levels of the Patrick model.
In the first time of using ICD-10, please mention the complete form of its name.
Please mention the amount of reliability.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on pages:5 and 3.

comment 4. In the section of results:
please remove table 3 and reports its content in the text with suitable sentences.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page :8

comment 5. In the Discussion section:
please clarify more this part and explain about the effects of the quality od coding in cancer registry applications.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page: 9

comment 6. Please explain about the Ethical considerations of your study.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page: 10.

Reviewer 2:

Comment[1]: In Abstract Line 24, the keywords must be written based on MeSH, e.g., 'clinical coding' instead of 'clinical coder'.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page: 1.

Comment[2]: In Introduction Line 64, the ICD-10 abbreviation should be defined.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page :3.

Comment[3]: In Method Line 117, report the value of Cronbach's alpha.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page : 5.

Comment[4]: In Method Line 121, report reliability.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page : 5.

Comment[5]: In Results, report the results of Table 3 within the text and remove the table.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page : 8.

Comment[6]: Discussion should be expanded and Conclusion should be added at the end.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on pages : 9 , 10.

Comment[7]: In the reference list, a link and date of access should be

added to References 14, 23, and 37. References 4, 8, 10, 19, and 34 should be corrected.

Response: Your suggested changes were applied on page: 12-17.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 1 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript is ready to be published
Kind Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 1 Nov 2021

Dear Associate Editor
In my opinion, this manuscript is well accepted

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 2 Nov 2021

Dear EIC
The authors addressed all of the necessary review comments

REFEREE : EIC — 28 Dec 2021

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.