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.96851
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(2); e96851

Peer Review Report for "Psychological Problems in Boys with Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML) with Central Nervous System (CNS) Involvement; A Descriptive Study"

Author(s): Manijeh Firoozi, Shima Rouhi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 24 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 28 Dec 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)

7 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is interesting but there are several mistakes in the writing of the manuscript. It needs minor revision. There are some point by point recommendation that may help the improvement of the quality of the manuscript:
- Please mention the design of the study in the end of the title.
- The abstract on the journal policy should be with structure.
- In the introduction section please refer to research necessity, In this study what does benefit compare to previous studies?
- Abstract structure is not regular.
- The design of the study is case-control no cross-sectional study.
- Please refer to the Method of sample size estimate.
- Method of sampling should be stated in the method of abstract.
- Please refer to the method of analysis.
- The level of significance should be mentioned in the methods of the abstract. Please refer to p-value.
- In the conclusion section should be the mechanism of disease effect on functions.

It would better that the authors used the “Mesh keyword, the keywords are not Mesh.
- In the introduction section, first, the prevalence of diabetes in the word, and finally please refer to prevalence in Iran.
- In this manuscript, the necessity of research is not clear, please refer to it. , this study what does benefit compare to previous studies?
Methods section:
- Why were men chosen, not women in this study?
- Eligibility criteria for centers and those performing the interventions should be stated in the method.
- What are the criteria for the diagnosis of AML?
- Suffering no, diagnosis of AML.
- In inclusion criteria, please refer to the city.
- Why diagnose the central nervous system involvement?
- You state “boy children aged between 7-12 years” why 7-12 years?
- Please explain the examiner's experiences.
- Please mention the ethical considerations of your study in the method section (Ethical code).
- Please mention the method of statistical analysis and assumptions for statistical tests.
Results:
- Please mention the assumptions for the statistical test in the initial result section.
- The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test should be mention with the p-value.
- Mean and SD should be present in one cloun.
- Delete the numbers reported in the text to avoid repetition.
Discussion
- Please compare and challenge these results with other published studies and discuss the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section, that’s what you said in not enough.
- Please write the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section. Increase the word count of discussion to 1000 words.
- The discussion needs adding the references (2017-2019) in the text.
- Please add at least 5 references above 2017.
- Some errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure exist in the paper, which impede reading.
- Please write the acknowledgment if applicable.
- Please add DOI, PubMed number and PubMed central.
- In the introduction section please refer to research necessity and purpose, this study does benefit compare to previous studies?
- Please write each section of the abstract in a separate paragraph.
- Before the beginning of this study.
“150 women with breast cancer who diagnosed 1.5-5 years before this study “do you mean short-term or longer-term cancer survivors?
- This original tool developed for long-term (>5 years) cancer survivors, in this case, there is ambiguity.
- At what stage were patients?
- Abstract structure is not regular.
- Please refer to the original version.

- What are the CVR and CVI in the abstract? In the first use please refer to full word.
- Is done Cultural adaptation?
- The data analysis method is ambiguous.
- The conclusion section should be answer to the introduction of the study.
- It would better that the authors used the “Mesh keyword, the keywords are not Mesh.
- In the introduction section, first, introduce breast cancer, then the prevalence in the word, and finally please refer to prevalence in Iran.
- “Quality of life in a patient with cancer after diagnosing and treatment process has high importance. Quality of life has an important role for understanding successful or failure in the treatment process”. This section needs to the reference.
- Eligibility criteria for centers and those performing the interventions should be stated in the method.
- Method of sample size calculation should be stated in the method section.
- Please use a data gathering form instead of the demographic questionnaire.
- Please explain the reliability of the questionnaire by mentioning the reference.
- Please mention the ethical considerations of your study.
- Please at the beginning of the discussion section, refer to the findings, briefly.
- Please compare and challenge these results with other published studies and discuss the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section, that’s what you said in not enough.
- The discussion needs adding the references in the text.
- Please write the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section. Increase the word count of discussion to 1000 words.
- Please write the acknowledgment if applicable.
- Some errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure exist in the paper, which impede reading.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
It seems that the manuscript needs a major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Please mention "conclusion" as a separate subtitle of the discussion part.
Please indicate which organization or university did you receive the ethical approval.
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.

Methods section:
Eligibility criteria for centres and those performing the interventions should be stated in method. in this study there is no intervention, by the way entrance and exist criteria is mentioned.
In inclusion criteria, please refer to city. Before criteria mention to city and hospital.
Why diagnosis the central nervous system involvement? Because we interested in study how the central nervous system involvement effect on psychological problems.

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) 30 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors may reply to reviewers' comments one by one and submit again.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
Please respond to the reviewer's comments one by one and submit again.
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.

Response to Respected Reviewer:

Thanks to the careful review of the manuscripts, it was attempted to correct the points that requested. All corrections are shown in yellow in text.

Please mention to the design of study in end of the title. It was corrected
The abstract on the journal policy should be with structure. It was corrected
In introduction section please refer to research necessity, this study what dose benefit compare to previous studies? It was corrected
Abstract structure is not regular. It was corrected
The design of study is case control no cross sectional study. It was corrected
Please refer to Method of sample size estimate. It was corrected
Method of sampling should be stated in the method of abstract. It was corrected
Please refer to the method of analysis. It was corrected
The level of significance should be mentioned in the methods of abstract. Please refer to p value. It was corrected
In conclusion section should be the mechanism of disease effect on functions. It was corrected
It would better that the authors used "Mesh keyword, the keywords are not Mesh. It was corrected
In introduction section, first, the prevalence of diabetes in the word and finally please refer to prevalence in the Iran. It was corrected
In this manuscript, the necessity of research is not clear, please refer to it. , this study what dose benefit compare to previous studies? It was corrected
Methods section:
Why were men chosen, not women in this study? The reaction of boys and girls to the disease may contrast. For this reason, the gender factor was controlled to better understand the impact of the disease on psychological responses.
Eligibility criteria for centers and those performing the interventions should be stated in method. It was corrected
What is the criteria for the diagnosis of AML? Medical records and practitioner's opinion
In inclusion criteria, please refer to city. It was corrected
Why diagnosis the central nervous system involvement? In previous studies, metastasis was not considered. Children with the early stages of cancer have different reactions to disease from children with the advanced stages. Metastasis to the central nervous system has different consequences from other areas. Therefore, considering these points will make the research more accurate.
You state "boy children aged between 7-12 years" why 7-12 years? The psychological response of children under 5 to the disease is not independent. It depends on the reactions of their parents. Adolescents who are more than 12 are not in the children group and are considered teenagers. Psychologically, the reactions of adolescents and children to difficult situations are completely different.
Please explain about the examiners experiences. Experimental design was not used in this study. A senior psychologist (Master degree) had completed the questionnaires in hospital.
Please mention the ethical considerations of your study in method section (Ethical code). It was corrected
Please mention to the method of statistical analysis and assumptions for statistical test. It was corrected

Results:
Please mention to the assumptions for statistical test in initial of result section. was corrected

The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test should be mention with p value. was corrected
Mean and SD should be present in one cloun. was corrected
Delete the numbers reported in the text to avoid repetition. was corrected
Discussion
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. was corrected
Please write the weaknesses and the strength of your study in this section. Increase the word count of discussion to 1000 words. was corrected
The discussion needs adding the references (2017-2019) in the text. was corrected
Please add at least 5 references above 2017. was corrected
Some errors in grammar, diction, and sentence structure exist in the paper, which impede reading. was corrected
Please write the acknowledgment if applicable. was corrected
Please add doi, PumMed number and PumMed central. was corrected

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 8 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The authors state “sampling was conducted randomly”, which one of the random methods.
Ethical code was not found (IR.SSU.MEDICINE.REC.1397.473), please submit the pdf file of Ethical code was approved.
they state “Metastasis to the central nervous system has different consequences from other areas”, Please refer to reference.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 8 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for submitting the manuscript to IJCM. Points to address are:
1. Please mention in the methods section, whether "informed" consent was taken from the participants.
2. Please mention in the methods section, which ethics committee approved the study.
3. Please add a conclusion paragraph to the end of the discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 8 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments.
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.

The latest changes have been Highlighted with green color throughout the paper.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
You state "sampling was conducted randomly", which one of the random method.

The sample size was calculated based on the Morgan table, and sampling was conducted randomly through the patients' list. All the patients with AML who referred to the Mahak children's hospital during spring and summer were listed in the patients' list and invited to participate in the study through phone calls.

You state "Metastasis to the central nervous system has different consequences from other areas", Please refer to reference.

In Participants of this study occurred metastases to the central nervous system that made the psychological state more complex. Furthermore, metastasis to the central nervous system has different consequences form other areas (6).

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Authors,
1. Please mention in the methods section, whether "informed" consent was taken from the participants.

Informed consent was taken from patients, and they had informed of the therapeutic goals before the intervention program launched. Their satisfaction was drawn to participate in the research. They were assured of the disguise of personal information and told, whenever they want, they could leave the research process

2. Please mention in the methods section, which ethics committee approved the study.

The ethical code was approved by the Iran national committee for ethics in Biomedical Research, University of Tehran

3. Please add a conclusion paragraph to the end of the discussion section.

Conclusion

The results indicate that, some factors associated with illness (such as anemia, hormone dysregulation and immune system deficit) and treatment (chemotherapy) caused some behavioral, emotional and cognitive problems in these children.

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) 24 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,
Thank you for revising your manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.
Please add the ORCID ID of the first and main author. In addition, please define all abbreviations used in each table, below that table.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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.

EIC Comments:

Add the ORCID ID of the first and main author.

Dr. Manijeh Firoozi (the First Author) 0000-0003-1368-7545

Shima Rouhi (the Corresponding Author) 0000-0003-2744-0375

In addition, please define all abbreviations used in each table, below that table.

Table1: demographic information of children with AML

Variables	M (SD)	Frequency, %
Age of child	9.4 (3.4)	
Education status		
Stop going to school		81.5
Going on go to school		18.5
Age of mother as caregiver	37.2 (5.3)	
Mother's education		
Diploma and under		10.6
University graduated		89.4
Father education		
Diploma and under		29.4
University graduated		70.6
Neuropathy problems		68%
Dizziness		21%
Headache		29%
Seizures		43%
Fatigue		78%
Anemia		85%
relapse experience		43%
Time diagnosis (in month)	37.2 (4.3)	

M, mean, SD, standard deviation

Table 2: T test to compare activities, social function, general competence, externalizing, internalizing and general problems in CBCL form

	children with AML	**healthy children**

P	T	SD±M	SD±M	Variable
001/0	84/3	4/57±11/57	1/08±8/56	externalizing problems
001/0	02/7	3/47±13/57	1/95±7/54	internalizing problems
0/05	48/4	6/36±10/37	5/73±8/86	general problems

M, mean, SD, standard deviation, T, t-test, P, p-value

Table 3: Mann-Whitney test to compare the behavioral-emotional problems in CBCL form

Mann-Whitney U		Children with AML	Healthy children	
P-Value		SD±M	SD±M	Variable
075/0	268	0/79±6/16	2/33±5/86	anxious/depressed
001/0	223	0/58±14/67	0/65±3/58	withdrawn/depressed
001/0	343	2/43±6/47	1/14±3/64	somatic complaints
001/0	284	1/34±6/53	1/23±4/37	social problems
0/05	5/383	1/23±8/21	2/34±6/29	thought problems
001/0	5/566	3/45±8/32	1/75±4/86	attention problems
0/001	572	0/12±3/76	0/76±7/35	rule-breaking behavior
001/0	368	2/34±4/85	2/86±9/68	aggressive behavior
0/02	298	1/47±5/07	2/11±7/24	Activities
001/0	562	0/08±4/96	1/54±7/54	social function
0/06	321	6/36±10/37	5/73±8/86	general problems
086/0	255/24	4/58±15/75	5/09±16/71	general competence
27/0	637	3/01±6/24	2/35±6/47	emotional problems
145/0	51/604	1/28±8/93	3/47±8/16	ADHD
0/11	216/1	2/38±5/11	3/24±4/52	PTSD

M, mean, SD, standard deviation, T, t-test, P, p-value, ADHD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, PTSD, post-traumatic stress disorder

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (4)** 28 Dec 2019

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.

Thanks.