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.98949
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(4); e98949

Peer Review Report for "Predicting Pain Catastrophizing of Women with Breast Cancer Based on Perceived Injustice and Past Time Perspective"

Author(s): Susan Alizadehfard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	23 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	3 Mar 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) — 26 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I made some minor corrections to the comment. Overall the article is appropriate and Printable after correction.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The article is valuable; new and interesting variables have been investigated. It can be printed after corrections. Note the comments in the text.
Thanks.

Manijeh Firoozi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 30 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The authors should use the following comments to modify the article:

Abstract

1. In methodology, not all women with breast cancer form the research population. List the hospitals in which the research was conducted, or the areas where the hospitals were located, as a community.

2. Keywords are not stated. Express them based on Mesh.

Introduction

3. which cultural, social, and psychological factors lead to perceptions of injustice in patients with cancer?

4. Discuss the previous findings about the time perspective in patients with cancer.

5. In the introduction, it is not mentioned the logical relationship between the variables and why the relationship between these variables has not been investigated in other studies.

6. The structure of the problem statement is not complete. The association of the present study with previous studies, the necessity of the research, and the main concern of the research should be stated in the last paragraph.

Methodology

7. Cluster sampling is suitable for large populations and not for a small sample such as (n=142). Please report the formula on which to obtain the sample number.

8. Mention the names of the hospitals that research carried out in them. Explain more about the sampling details. If you have reported sampling incorrectly, please correct it. Describe the logic of using cluster sampling in methodology.

9. State the type of research, the population study, the entry and exit criteria of the study, the ethics issues, the Ethics Code, the stages of implementation of the research, and the statistical method and software used in the research.

Results

10. Report in Table 1. demographic and characteristics of disease such as stage of cancer, time of diagnosis, type of treatment, and other issues are related to cancer in participants.

11. You can use abbreviations (such as PI, PN) when reporting them completely below the table.

12. Independent Variables, according to the definition presented, may not be independent, so reporting the correlation between these two variables is necessary to prevent multiple linear effects, and this correlation is not presented in the paper.

13 . In Table 1, what is the purpose of the fifth column while there are 4 variables?

14. You need to use another statistical method such as path analysis to show the relationship between variables.

Discussion and conclusion

15. Comparison of findings research to previous research is not enough. As far as possible, these variables should be compared with other findings and the similarities and differences with the present study discussed.

16. The explanation of the findings should be based on the theory you used and the variables you have arranged. Since you have not clearly stated the theory, it is difficult to explain the results. Please clarify the theory both in the Introduction and Conclusion.

17 . In the limitations of the study, you mentioned death anxiety and pain intensity. Since they are not variables of your study, the explanation about them leads to confusion. Set limitations based on methodological issues.

18. Based on the findings, make suggestions for future researches.

19. Add other areas such as acknowledgment, conflict of interest, and financial support for

the research.

20. Modify the references according to the Vancouver format. For example, the names of the journals in this format are not italic. See the authors' guide for increased accuracy. Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Nov 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's comments.

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.

Reviewer 1:

Abstract

1- Perceived injustice or injustice experiences? Write similar phrase in all part of article.
   - All items were corrected and similar, only "The Injustice Experiences Questionnaire" is unchanged because it is a name of the Questionnaire that measure perceived injustice (It is highlighted in lines 13, 14, 15, 18, 21 of the abstract).

Method

2- Which city or which hospitals?
   - The city and name of the hospitals was introduced (It is highlighted in lines 2, 3 of the method).
   -
3- What matter that samples married or employed?
   - These items have been deleted.

Results

4- Write the footnote of tables in a smaller font.
   - This item was done (It is highlighted in footnote of table 2, 3).

Discussion

5- In 4th paragraph: "but not by past". Past what? Positive or negative?
   - This part of discussion was changed completely and this sentence was deleted.

Limitation

6- In 2th paragraph: "… to explore this issue." And other factors that involved.
   - This part of limitation was changed completely and this sentence was deleted.

Reviewer 2:

Method

1- Which women? Introduce them.
   - This item was done (It is highlighted in lines 6, 7, 8 of the method).
2- Which hospitals or medical centers?
   - This item was done (It is highlighted in lines 2, 3 of the method).
3- Their marital status and education are not important.
   - These items have been deleted.
4- Their cancer step is the matter.
   - These items have been introduced in line 7 of the method.

Measures

5- Perceived injustice?
- Perceived injustice was measured by this Questionnaire (It is highlighted in lines 1 of the measures).
6- The amount of alpha in this research?

- These amounts were highlighted in the last line of each measure).

Results

7- Write PC instead of PCS
- This item was done (It is highlighted in tables 3).
8- The Q for questionnaire in IEQ is not required.
- This item was changed to the name of variable: PC /Pain Catastrophizing (It is highlighted in tables 2).
9- Scale in footnote of table 1, Catastrophizing scale, is not required.
- This item was changed to the name of variable: PC /Pain Catastrophizing (It is highlighted in tables 2).
10- Instead of "This result illustrated in tables 2" write these results.
- This item was changed and highlighted before tables 3.
11- Why there is column 5 in table 2?
- This item was deleted.
12- In table 2, before PCS have to write 4; and after P≤ 0.01 have to write nothing.
- This item was changed and highlighted before tables 3.
13- In paragraph: " Also as showed … increase into step1 (0.19). From this finding it can be concluded that injustice experiences is a mediator …", First step or last step? And injustice experiences are…
- This item was changed and highlighted in lines 4, 5, 6, 7 after tables 4.

Discussion

14- In the end of paragraph 2, write its reference.
- This part of discussion was changed completely and this sentence was deleted.
15- In the end of paragraph 3, past what??
- This part of discussion was changed completely and this sentence was deleted.

Associate Editor 1:

Abstract

1- In methodology, not all women with breast cancer form the research population. List the hospitals in which the research was conducted, or the areas where the hospitals were located, as a community.

- This item has been corrected; the research population and name of city and hospitals added in method of abstract, and 1th paragraph of method.

2- Keywords are not stated. Express them based on Mesh.

- This item has been added and highlighted after abstract.

Introduction

3- Which cultural, social, and psychological factors lead to perceptions of injustice in patients with cancer?

- This item has been added and highlighted in 3th paragraph of background, lines 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

4- Discuss the previous findings about the time perspective in patients with cancer.

- This item has been added and highlighted in 4th paragraph of background, lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

5- In introduction, it is not mentioned to the logical relationship between the variables and why the relationship between these variables has not been investigated in other studies.

- This item has been added and highlighted in 5th paragraph of background.

6- The structure of the problem statement is not complete. The association of the present study with previous studies, the necessity of the research, and the main concern of the research should be stated in the last paragraph.

- The infrastructural model of variables has added and highlighted in 2th paragraph of background. Also Theoretical explanation was highlighted in 6th and 7th paragraph of background. The main concern of the research has been added in last paragraph of background.

Methodology

7- Cluster sampling is suitable for large populations and not for a small sample such as (n=142). Please report the formula on which obtain the sample number.

- The sampling style was corrected and changed to availability sampling method (highlighted in lines 5, 6 of method). Also because the 219 patients were in 5 hospitals and based on the Krejcie and Morgan Table, the sample size was calculate 140 (highlighted in lines 3, 4, 5 of method).

8- Mention to the names of the hospitals that research carried out in them. Explain more about the sampling details. If you have reported sampling incorrectly, please correct it. Describe the logic of using cluster sampling in methodology.

- The name of city and hospitals was added and highlighted in lines 2, 3 of method. The sampling details were added and highlighted in 2th paragraph of method.

9- State the type of research, the population study, the entry and exit criteria of study, the ethics issues, Ethics Code, the stages of implementation of the research and the statistical method and software used in the research.

- The type research and population were added highlighted in 1, 2, 3 lines of method. The inclusion criteria were added and highlighted in 3th paragraph of method, lines 1, 2, 3. The ethics issues in 3th paragraph of method, lines 3, 4, 5, 6; and the statistical method and software used in the research in lines 6, 7, 8 of 3th paragraph of method were highlighted. Also this study is a real retrospective study and Ethical Approval Code is optional in these types of studies.

Results

10- Report in Table 1. demographic and characteristics of disease such as stage of cancer, time of diagnosis, type of treatment, and other issues are related to cancer in participants.

- This table was added and highlighted as table 1.

11- You can use abbreviations (such as PI, PN) when reporting them completely in below of the table.

- These items were changed and highlighted in below of table 3.

12- Independent Variables, according to the definition presented, may not be independent, so reporting the correlation between these two variables is necessary to prevent multiple linear effects, and this correlation is not presented in the paper.

- The correlation between these variables are presented in table 3.

13- In Table 1, what is the purpose of the fifth column while there are 4 variables?

- This item was corrected.

14- You need to use another statistical method such as path analysis to show the relationship between variables.

- The path analysis method was implemented and the results are shown in Table 5.

Discussion and conclusion

15- Comparison of findings research to previous research is not enough. As far as possible, these variables should be compared with other findings and the similarities and differences with the present study discussed.

- The results compared with previous researches and highlighted in 1th and 2th paragraph of discussion.

16- The explanation of the findings should be based on the theory you used and the variables you have arranged. Since you have not clearly stated the theory, it is difficult to explain the results. Please clarify the theory both in the Introduction and Conclusion.

- The explanation of the findings was completely changed and rewrite based on infrastructural model of variables.

17- In the limitations of the study, you mentioned death anxiety and pain intensity. Since they are not variables of your study, the explanation about them lead to confusing. Set limitation based on methodological issues.

- The limitations was corrected.

18- Based on the findings, make suggestions for future researches.

- The future research suggestion was added and highlighted in the end of limitations.

19- Add other areas such as acknowledgment, conflict of interest, and financial support for the research.

- Acknowledgment, conflict of interest, and financial support were added in the end of article and highlighted.

20- Modify the references according to the Vancouver format. For example, the names of the journals in this format are not italic. See the authors' guide for increased accuracy.

- They were all changed to Vancouver format.

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) 14 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
All corrections have been made and the article is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 18 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The author has done all the edits in the revised version and I think the article is acceptable.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 24 Jan 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. Please state clearly in the methods section of the manuscript body:
1. Which ethics committee approved the study.
2. Whether informed consent was taken from the study participants.
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.

EIC comment:

1. Which ethics committee approved the study?
2. Whether informed consent was taken from the study participants.

- This items were done and highlighted in lines 8, 9 of the method.

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) 3 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.