

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-157898>

Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 18(1) ; e157898

Peer Review Report for "Age-Standardized Cancer Incidence Rate and Ethnicity in Iran"

Author(s): Babak Eshrati, Zahra Rampisheh, Neda Soleimanvandi Azar, Amirhossein Eftekhari, Batool Tayefi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Nov 2024

Revised Date: 30 Dec 2024

Accepted Date: 16 Mar 2025

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

8 Dec 2024

Dear AE,

There are several points that should be considered and need to modify.

1. Method and Material:

- a. The title of the manuscript is "Age-Standardized Cancer Incidence Rates and Ethnicity in Iran," and it must also report incidence rates by five age groups.
- b. Local indicators of spatial autocorrelation (Getis-Ord test) are use for spatial analysis. Please do them.
- c. Which classification method is used for mapping incidence rates (manual, equal interval, defined interval, quantile, natural breaks, geometrical interval, or standard deviation)? Please explain your reasoning.

1. Results:

- a. please modify table 4 for Non-Hodgkins Lymphoma. P-Value column must replace.

b. In page 7 before discussion, you stated that "In none of the models that became significant, none of the ethnic groups significantly predicted the incidence of the investigated cancers, and the only variable that significantly predicted the incidence of the investigated cancers (except skin cancer) was the human development index (Table 4)". But according to table 4, Your interpretation is different from the results in these table. Correct it.

Kind Regards

Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari : Associate Editor

8 Dec 2024

Dear EIC,

The manuscript has been studied, and some comments should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

AE

Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari : EIC

8 Dec 2024

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

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-in-Chief,

We appreciate you and the reviewers for your precious time in reviewing our paper and providing valuable comments. It was your valuable and insightful comments that led to possible improvements in the current version.

The authors have carefully considered the comments and tried our best to address every one of them. We hope the manuscript after careful revisions meets your high standards. The authors welcome further constructive comments if any.

Below we provide the point-by-point responses. All modifications in the manuscript have been highlighted in yellow:

Reviewer 1:

We would like to sincerely thank you for your insightful comments and constructive feedback. Your detailed review helped identify areas where the manuscript could be improved, particularly the consistency between the text and the results presented in Table 4. We have made the necessary revisions to address your concerns, and we believe these changes have enhanced the clarity and accuracy of the manuscript. We greatly appreciate your time and effort in reviewing our work. All modifications in the manuscript have been highlighted in yellow:

- 1- Unfortunately, the data utilized in our analysis were provided by the Iranian Ministry of Health, and we do not have access to the original dataset to enable such stratification. Our study focuses on age-standardized incidence rates (ASIR) to control for the varying age distribution across provinces and facilitate meaningful comparisons. While age-specific rates can offer valuable insights into the distribution of cancer across age groups, the data limitations and our study's primary objective—assessing overall patterns across ethnic groups—led us to rely exclusively on ASIR.
- 2- In our study, we utilized the Getis-Ord G_i^* statistic to identify hotspots and coldspots, which are visualized in Figures 4 and 5. To address this comment, we have revised the methods section to explicitly describe the application of the Getis-Ord G_i^* statistic in our analysis.
- 3- For this study, we used the "Natural Breaks (Jenks)" method to classify the data. This method was selected because it is commonly employed to identify natural groupings inherent in the data, minimizing variance within classes and maximizing variance between classes. However, we acknowledge that the decision to use this method was based on convention rather than a detailed comparison with alternative classification methods. We added this

clarification in the methods section. If the reviewer prefers a specific classification method, we are willing to reclassify the data accordingly and update the maps as needed.

4- We appreciate the reviewer's feedback regarding Table 4 and its relevance to Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma. However, we would appreciate clarification on the specific modification required for the P-Value column. If the intent is to adjust the presentation, labeling, or inclusion criteria for the P-Values, we are happy to implement the necessary changes. Please let us know your preference so we can ensure the table meets the expectations.

5- We appreciate your observation. Upon reviewing the manuscript, we agree that there was an inconsistency between the text and the results in Table 4. The corrected phrase now reads:

"In the models that were significant, the Lor ethnicity was the only protective ethnicity for "all cancers" and "breast cancer". The HDI was the only significant factor in all significant models, except for skin cancer."

This revision aligns the narrative with the results presented in Table 4.

AI-generated review:

We would like to thank the editor-in-chief for including the AI-generated review. However, after carefully reviewing the feedback, we believe that the comments are based on a misunderstanding of our study design by the AI. Specifically, the review seems to conflate our "ecological" study with a "cohort" study. As our study is an ecological analysis, many of the suggestions made, such as those regarding individual-level data or cohort-based analysis, do not apply to our study's methodology. We would appreciate it if these comments could be reconsidered in light of the correct study design.

Sincerely,

B. T., MD, MPH

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari : Associate Editor

16 Mar 2025

Dear EIC

Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.

Kind regards.

Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari : EIC

16 Mar 2025

Dear Author,

We appreciate your submission to the International Journal of Contemporary Management (IJCM). Thank you for sharing your work with us; we look forward to reviewing your contributions to the field.

Kind Regards

EIC