Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 13 · Issue 1 · e145700

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Integrated Colorectal Cancer Screening Based on Decision Support Information System

Elham Maserat

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
5 Feb 2024	28 Feb 2024	5 Mar 2024	10.5812/jcrps-145700

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 24 Feb 2024 – 24 Feb 2024

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 24 Feb 2024

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 24 Feb 2024

Minor Revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor

The manuscript was edited.

Thanks for the review and valuable comments.

Reviewer 2:
- In the abstract section (method): What did you check with the checklist (sampels)

This section has been completed.

- In the introduction, after reference 12 (lines 51 and 52) should be deleted or mentioned in the method.

This section has been deleted.

-in the introduction, Line 62 needs reference .

This section had no reference and was deleted.

-At the end of the introduction, the purpose of this study and the application of the results should be mentioned.

This section has been completed.

-How many people checked the validity of the checklist? And were the same items approved or increased or decreased? (line 90)

15 people evaluated the reliability and validity of the checklist.

- In the method part, it is better to use the indefinite article instead of we(line 91).

This section has been edited.

- In line 92 to 95 it is mentioned that all the systems are extracted order. Are the statistics of these systems mentioned in the results?

All screening information systems were evaluated in the study environment (Gastroenterology and Liver Research Institute) and the results were presented in the results tables.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 5 Mar 2024 – 5 Mar 2024

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 5 Mar 2024

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 5 Mar 2024

Accept