**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

Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/compreped.110142
Published in: Journal of Comprehensive Pediatrics: 12(1) ; e110142

# Peer Review Report for "The Role of National Media Programs in the Prevention of Childhood Cancer"

**Author(s):** Mohammad Kajiyazdi, Nayereh Jesmani, Kambiz Eftekhari

**Review Timeline:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 27 Oct 2020 |
| Revised Date: | 22 Nov 2020 |
| Accepted Date: | 24 Nov 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

3 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
It seems these following recommends would be helpful to improve this paper:
1. Please specify SPSS version
2. Statistical analysis is incomplete (p value ??). Significant correlation between data have not ben analyzed. It should be analyzed by an expert statistician
3. The age and gender of the participants are not mentioned.
4. In the discussion part comparison of the results of present study with previous study should be done. Related article should be used in the discussion part.
5. Please add a scientific discussion of the strengths and limitations associated with this report.

The article is acceptable after revision and making considered changes.
Thanks.

**REFEREE** : Reviewer

7 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting this article to the journal.
Due to the increasing prevalence of malignancy in children, the need for more awareness for early diagnosis, this type of information is a good way.
Thanks.,

**REFEREE** : Associate Editor

8 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

**REFEREE** : EIC

8 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' request.
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:**

Dear author

Thank you for submitting of your article in the journal.

Due to the increasing prevalence of malignancy in children, the need for more awareness for early diagnosis, this type of information is a good way.

Dear reviewer, Thank you very much for your attention and kindness.

**Reviewer 2:**

Dear reviewer, Thank you very much for your valuable comments

Based on your suggestions, corrections were made and specified in the text of the article.

1. Please specify SPSS version.
   The version of SPSS added.

2. Statistical analysis is incomplete (P-value??).
   The P-Value of the data was added.

3. Significant correlation between data has not been analyzed. It should be analyzed by an expert statistician.
   There was a significant difference between the groups in terms of the effectiveness of the radio and television medical programs in preventing cancer in children. (P-value=0.000)
   There was a significant difference between the groups in terms of simplicity and comprehensibility of the radio and television programs. (P-value=0.000)

4. The age and gender of the participants are not mentioned.
   One hundred and eighteen (33.1%) participants in the study were male. The mean age of them were 30 ± 10 years (20-61 years).

5. In the discussion part comparison of the results of present study with previous study should be done. Related article should be used in the discussion part.

   According to our knowledge and searching in the scientific sources, there are very limit articles on the role of public media in preventing childhood cancer. There are more studies in other diseases, some of which are mentioned in the discussion.

6. Please add a scientific discussion of the strengths and limitations associated with this report.

   The strengths of this study include:

   - ✓ The first study was on the effectiveness of public media on the prevention of childhood cancer.
   - ✓ Surveys were conducted in all age groups, sex, and level of education.
   - ✓ The effectiveness of the media was evaluated in different separate groups.

   The limitations of this study include:

   - ✓ Difficulty communicating with the cancer group.
   - ✓ Impossibility of access to the cancer group.

## OPEN PEER REVIEW

### Revision (1)

**REFEREE** : Reviewer — 19 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Significant correlations between groups should also be included in the tables (table 1, 2, 3).
2. What statistical test was used to compare data between groups?
Thanks.

**REFEREE** : Associate Editor — 19 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

**REFEREE** : EIC — 19 Nov 2020

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 (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.

Dear Reviewer

Thank you very much for your comments

1. Significant correlation between groups should also be included in the tables (table 1, 2, 3).
   Significant correlations between groups were added in Tables 2 and 3.

2. What statistical test was used to compare data between groups?
   Chi-square test was used to analyze the nominal qualitative data.

## OPEN PEER REVIEW

### Revision (2)

**REFEREE** : Reviewer — 24 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

**REFEREE** : Associate Editor — 24 Nov 2020

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

**REFEREE** : EIC — 24 Nov 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.