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.88905
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(3); e88905

Peer Review Report for "Distress Tolerance in Mothers of Children with Cancer for Predicting Her Parenting Style and Child's Attachment Behaviors: A Cross Sectional Study"

Author(s): Manijeh Firoozi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Jan 2019
Revised Date:	18 Jan 2020
Accepted Date:	26 Jan 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)

16 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is interesting but there are several mistakes in the writing of the manuscript. It needs major revision. There is some point by point recommendation that may help the improvement of the quality of the manuscript:
- Should be mentioned to the study design in title of manuscript.
- This study seems to be cross- sectional study.
- It is not clear sampling method in this study.
- The level of significance, and statistical software and its version should be mentioned in the methods of abstract.
- Should be mentioned to the statistical method for data analysis in abstract section.
- Please state the exact p value in the abstract and the text.
- The various sections of abstract do not fit.
- It would better that the authors used "Mesh keyword.
- In introduction please cite a reference for this sentence (primary paragraph in introduction section).
- Which theory supports the relationship between your variables??

- The end of introduction, explain why important investigate this subject.
- In this manuscript, the necessity of research is not clear, please refer to it.
- This study seems to be cross- sectional study.
- This sentence do not suitable for this section (second line in methods section).
- Method of sample size estimation should be stated in the method section.
- What the state of cancer ? (inclusions criteria).
- This criteria is not necessary for cross-sectional design (inability to continue.....).
- Do you mean psychological disorder or subsyndromal symptoms (a history of psychological problems)?
- What is the statistical method for data analysis (end of the method section)?
- The level of significance, and statistical software and its version should be mentioned in the methods section.
- Before the use of statistical method, please mention to the assumptions.
- Please mention to the other demographical information (the beginning of the results section).
- A column in enough (in table 1). Mean + SD
- Please mention the reasons of choosing the statistical methods.
- In initial section of discussion, should be mention to purpose of study.
- Please compare and challenge these results with other published studies and discuss about the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section, that's what you said in not enough.
- This reference do not relate with your study (number reference of 20-21, 23).
- Please refer to limitations of study.
- Some errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure exist in the paper, which impede reading.
- Please write the acknowledgment and conflict of interest if applicable.
- The references format are not in accordance with journal policy.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 10 May 2019

Dear AE,

- There is no reference to the first paragraph.
- The writing is required to correct.
- In the second paragraph, the last line, is not a suitable place to problem statement.
- At the end of the introduction, the purpose of the study has been expressed twice.
- The last line is redundant in methodology.
- Limitations and suggestions of study are not provided.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2019

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs revision.

Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 19 May 2019

Dear author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the comments.

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.

All the reviewers' comments were done and displayed in the final version in yellow color.

- Should be mentioned to the study design in title of manuscript. ☺
- This study seems to be cross- sectional study. ☺
- It is not clear sampling method in this study. ☺
- The level of significance, and statistical software and its version should be mentioned in the methods of abstract. ☺
- Should be mentioned to the statistical method for data analysis in abstract section. ☺
- Please state the exact p value in the abstract and the text. ☺
- The various sections of abstract do not fit. ☺
- It would better that the authors used “Mesh keyword. ☺
- In introduction please cite a reference for this sentence (primary paragraph in introduction section). ☺
- Which theory supports the relationship between your variables? Theory of Baumrind about parenting style that mention in introduction. ☺
- The end of introduction, explain why important investigate this subject. ☺
- In this manuscript, the necessity of research is not clear, please refer to it. ☺
- This study seems to be cross- sectional study. ☺
- This sentence do not suitable for this section (second line in methods section). ☺
- Method of sample size estimation should be stated in the method section. ☺
- What the state of cancer ? (inclusions criteria). ☺
- This criteria is not necessary for cross-sectional design (inability to continue.....). ☺
- Do you mean psychological disorder or subsyndromal symptoms (a history of psychological problems)? ☺
- What is the statistical method for data analysis (end of the method section)? ☺
- Before the use of statistical method, please mention to the assumptions. ☺
- Please mention to the other demographical information (the beginning of the results section). ☺
- A column in enough (in table 1). Mean + SD☺
- Please compare and challenge these results with other published studies and discuss about the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section, that’s what you said in not enough. ☺
- This reference do not relate with your study (number reference of 20-21, 23). ☺
- Please refer to limitations of study. ☺
- Some errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure exist in the paper, which impede reading. ☺
- Please write the acknowledgment and conflict of interest if applicable. ☺
- The references format are not in accordance with journal policy. ☺

Reviewer 2:
- There is no reference to the first paragraph. ☺
- The writing is required to correct. ☺
- In the second paragraph, the last line, is not a suitable place to problem statement. ☺
- At the end of the introduction, the purpose of study has been expressed twice. ☺
- The last line is redundant in methodology. ☺
- Limitations and suggestions of study are not provided. ☺

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) 9 Jun 2019

Deat AE,
- The order of the abstract is not correct, The authors may use this order: introduction, study of design, time / place, research population, method of estimating sample size, sampling method/s, assessments, methods of statistical analysis, the level of significance, data analysis software, software version, results, conclusion.
- The section of conclusion should be completed with practical recommendations.
- The introduction section, you did not answer the question that which theory supports the relationship between your variables?
- The necessity of research is not clear, please mention to it. To answer this question you should refer to theoretical basis and scientific literature.
- In method section, should be refer to state of cancer, furthermore, you mentioned to “at least 6 months after a cancer diagnosis” what is the reason for this criteria?
- What is the statistical method for data analysis?
- The level of significance, and statistical software and its version should be mentioned in the methods section.
- Please mention to the other demographical information.
- Please mention the reasons of choosing the statistical methods
- Before the use of statistical method, please mention to the assumptions.
- Discussion section, should be mention to the purpose of study.
- The limitations of study to be place in Discussion section.
- The manuscript need of substantial editing for grammatical errors.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 24 Jun 2019

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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Jun 2019

Dear Author,

please revise your manuscript based on the comments. Also, please improve the English grammar writing of the manuscript.

Thank you

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.

Response To Reviewer:

The order of the abstract is not correct, please use this order: introduction, study of design, time / place, research population, method of estimating sample size, sampling method/s, assessments, methods of statistical analysis, the level of significance, data analysis software, software version, results, conclusion. OK

The section of conclusion should be completed with practical recommendations. OK

In introduction section, you did not answer the question that which theory supports the relationship between your variables? OK

The necessity of research is not clear, please mention to it. To answer this question, you should refer to theoretical basis and scientific literature. OK

In method section, should be refer to state of cancer, furthermore, you mentioned to “at least 6 month after cancer diagnosis” what is the reason of this criteria? : because 6 month after diagnosis most of mothers experience PTSD. They need to time to recovery themselves.

What is the statistical method for data analysis? OK

The level of significance, and statistical software and its version should be mentioned in the methods section. OK

Please mention to the other demographical information: There is no additional information in this study.

Please mention the reasons of choosing the statistical methods: in OBJECTIVE after introduction, it was mentioned to main purpose of study. In DISCUSSION it was explain shortly about results.

Before the use of statistical method, please mention to the assumptions. OK

Discussion section, should be mention to purpose of study: purpose of study must come in the end of introduction not at the discussion.

The limitations of study to be place in Discussion section.

The manuscript need of substantial editing for grammatical errors.

Attention: there is a big limitation for words of article in this journal. We have to reduce main structure of manuscript if increase details. I tried to obey the comments but It is not possible to pay attention to details anymore.

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.

Bijan Pirnia: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 30 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
- In the introduction section, the author did not answer the question that which theory supports the relationship between your variables?
- The necessity of research is not clear, please mention it. To answer this question, you should refer to the theoretical basis and scientific literature, with reference. you mention to because 6 months after diagnosis most mothers experience PTSD. They need time to recovery themselves, have you a reference for this subject?
- The level of significance should be mentioned in the methods section.
- Please mention to the other demographical information: There is no additional information in this study.
- Please mention the reasons for choosing the statistical methods.
- Before the use of the statistical method, please mention to the assumptions.
- The limitations of the study to be placed in the Discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 6 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewer's comments this manuscript should be revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript according to the above comments and resubmit again.
Thanks.

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.

Information about consent form and article type was corected

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) 26 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
This is my pleasure to announce to 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.