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.90225
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(8); e90225

Peer Review Report for "Perceived Behavioral Control in Mammography: A Qualitative Study of Iranian Women's Experiences"

Author(s): Zahra Khazir, Mohammad Ali Morowatisharifabad, Aliakbar Vaezi, Behnaz Enjezab, Fatemeh Yari, Hossein Fallahzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Feb 2019
Revised Date:	25 May 2019
Accepted Date:	28 May 2019

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) 20 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
In abstract:
- In the background section instead of "Khorramabad" write: "Khorammabad Lorestan, Iran (XX kilometers north of Persian Gulf"
- In the result section: about these sentences: having faith and heart belief in god" please describe what was their heart believe? either you have faith or not \- having faith is enough.
In background:
- In the last paragraph of background(....in the women in Khorramabad to better understand....), it is better to write "study population " instead of "Khorramabad"
METHODOLOGY:
- IN 2.2 data analysis section: in the first line (Graneheim and Lundman steps) need a reference.
- Table 1:
row 16: family history in family / first-degree relatives: family history or what? write down what exactly asked.
- IN section 3.3.1: Embarrassment: use "unmarried women" instead of "single woman"
- In section 4.3.4.3. barriers related to mammography, write barriers related to

mammography screening performance.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Apr 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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 20 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
Your manuscript needs major revision, please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer comments, In addition, add the ethics committee approval of the study to the methods section.
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.

Original comments of the reviewer1	Reply by the correspond author	Changes done on page number and line number
:In abstract in the background section instead of "Khorramabad" write: "Khorammabad Lorestan, Iran (XX kilometers north of Persian ″Gulf	corrections were made	:In abstract in the background, Line 4
:In abstract in the result section: about these sentences: having faith and heart beliefe inGod" please describe what was their heart believe? either .you have faith or not \- having faith is enough	Faith in God was a comfort for the participants and the acceptance of God's favor	:In abstract in the result section, Line 4 & 5
:In background in the last paragraph of background(....in the women in Khorramabad to better understand....), it is better to write "study "population " instead of "Khorramabad	corrections were made	:In background Line 44
:METHODOLOGY IN 2.2data analysis section: in the first line (Graneheim and Lundman steps) need a .reference	added	in Methodologhy IN 2.2data analysis,Line 6
row 16: family history in family / first-degree relatives: family history or what? write down what exactly asked	family history	row 16 family history
IN section 3.3.1: Embarrassment: use ""unmarried women" instead of "single woman	corrections were made	IN section 3.3.1 Line 2 & 8
in section 4.3.4.3. barriers related to mammography, write: barriers related to mammography screening performance	It was written	in section 4.3.4.3 Barriers Related to Mammography Screening Performance
add the ethics committee approval of the study to the methods section	added	in Methodologhy 2.3.Ethical consideration, Line 1- 5

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 May 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 May 2019

Dear Author,
Your manuscript is considered as an accepted article, It is necessary to add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors, Please add the ORCID id of the manuscript authors in the authors section in the submission process.
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.

Original comments of the reviewer1	Reply by the correspond author	Changes done on page number and line number
:In abstract in the background section instead of "Khorramabad" write: "Khorammabad Lorestan, Iran (XX kilometers north of Persian ″Gulf	corrections were made	:In abstract in the background, Line 4
:In abstract in the result section: about these sentences: having faith and heart beliefe inGod" please describe what was their heart believe? either .you have faith or not \- having faith is enough	Faith in God was a comfort for the participants and the acceptance of God's favor	:In abstract in the result section, Line 4 & 5
:In background in the last paragraph of background(....in the women in Khorramabad to better understand....), it is better to write "study "population " instead of "Khorramabad	corrections were made	:In background Line 44
:METHODOLOGY IN 2.2data analysis section: in the first line (Graneheim and Lundman steps) need a .reference	added	in Methodologhy IN 2.2data analysis,Line 6
row 16: family history in family / first-degree relatives: family history or what? write down what exactly asked	family history	row 16 family history
IN section 3.3.1: Embarrassment: use ""unmarried women" instead of "single woman	corrections were made	IN section 3.3.1 Line 2 & 8
in section 4.3.4.3. barriers related to mammography, write: barriers related to mammography screening performance	It was written	in section 4.3.4.3 Barriers Related to Mammography Screening Performance
add the ethics committee approval of the study to the methods section	added	in Methodologhy 2.3.Ethical consideration, Line 1- 5

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) 28 May 2019

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.