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

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.113340
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 10(3); e113340

Peer Review Report for "Evaluating the Knowledge and Attitude of Menopaused Women for Breast Cancer Screening: A Cross Sectional Study in Iran"

Author(s): Vahid Kohpeima Jahromi, Nader Sharifi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Jan 2021
Revised Date:	14 Apr 2021
Accepted Date:	3 May 2021

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)

2 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- Only the attitude is written in the title, while in the method, findings, discussion, and conclusion, knowledge is also talked about.
2- independent samples" t-tests should be written correctly in all of the manuscript.
3- Given that the type of this study is descriptive, the use of the word relationship is not correct and the word association should be used instead.
4- In the method section written: "To select the samples, 120 66 people were randomly selected from the women's files" what files? please explain.
5- Cronbach's alpha coefficient is not indicated by r.
6- Cronbach's alpha is between 0 and 1, how is it that the value for the attitude is between 7.2 and 7.9.
7- The number of tables is large. If possible, the tables should be merged.
8- A number of P-valu are written with one decimal number that must match the rest of the p-values.
9- In the discussion, it is better to first compare the results of the study with other similar studies in Iran and then mention the studies conducted in other countries. Because the cultural context and programs of the countries' health systems, especially in the case of

cancer screening, may differ from one another.
10- reference 14 is not correct.
11- in discussion section written : "As in the present study and other studies in which the level of literacy of women has been low, radio and television and health workers have had the greatest impact on raising knowledge about breast cancer and its screening while in studies on educated women, print media has been reported as the main source of information"
in this study on 15% participants are illiterate,How did you come to this conclusion?
12- Write limitations instead of disadvantage and write the strengths of this study more realistically and scientifically.
13- please explain in method section positive and negative attitude.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs essential correction. I think this paper should be corrected basically.
Thank you very much.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Mar 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts. I give you a chance to revise your manuscript then I recommend you revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

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.

Reply to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer Number	Original comments of the reviewer	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page number and line number
1	*1-Only the attitude is written in the title, while in the method, findings, discussion and conclusion, knowledge is also talked about.*	added	Page: 1 Line Number: 1
	2-independent samples" t-tests should be written correctly in all of the manuscript.	According to the respected Reviewers, the type of test changed	
	3-Given that the type of this study is descriptive, the use of the word relationship is not correct and the word association should be used instead.	Corrected throughout the text	
	4-In the method section written : "To select the samples, 120 66 people were randomly selected from the women's files" what files? please explain.	It was explained	Page: 2 Line Number: 65-67
	5-Cronbach's alpha coefficient is not indicated by r.	corrected	Page: 2 Line Number: 73
	6-Cronbach's alpha is between 0 and 1,how is it that the value for the attitude is between 7.2 and 7.9.	corrected	Page: 2 Line Number: 86
	7-The number of tables is large. If possible, the tables should be merged.	The tables were merged and reduced to three tables	Page: 2 Line Number: 65-67
	8-A number of P-valu are written with one decimal number that must match the rest of the p-values.	corrected	Page: 3-4 Line Number: 108-127

	9-In the discussion, it is better to first compare the results of the study with other similar studies in Iran and then mention the studies conducted in other countries. Because the cultural context and programs of the countries' health systems, especially in the case of cancer screening, may differ from one another.	corrected	Page: 4-5 Line Number: 130-148
	10-reference 14 in not correct	Reference 14 was deleted	
	11- in discussion section written : "As in the present study and other studies in which the level of literacy of women has been low, radio and television and health workers have had the greatest impact on raising knowledge about breast cancer and its screening while in studies on educated women, print media has been reported as the main source of information" *in this study on 15% participants are illiterate,How did you come to this conclusion?*	It was explained In terms of education level, the majority of people were under diploma 57 (47.5%) and illiterate 18 (15%).	Page: 5 Line Number: 160-161
	12-Write limitation instead of disadvantage and write the strengths of this study more realistically and scientifically.	corrected	Page: 5 Line Number: 182-187
	13- please explain in method section positive and negative attitude.	It was explained	Page: 2 Line Number: 83-84

2	*: Attitude of Menopaused Women for Breast Cancer Screening: A Cross-Sectional Study* *Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. Please see my comments as follows:* *While there are some studies that evaluated the attitude of Iranian women about the screening of breast cancer, what are the justifications of authors for conducting research again?* *Examples:* بررسی آگاهی و نگرش زنان شهر یزد در مورد رفتار غربالگری سرطان پستان در سال *1391* بررسی آگاهی، نگرش و رفتارهای پیشگیرانه از سرطان پستان در زنان مراجعه کننده به مراکز بهداشتی- درمانی شهر یزد در سال *1394* بررسی رفتار غربالگری سرطان پستان درزنان شهر شیراز در سال *1395* نوع مقاله : اصیل پژوهشی	It was explained Considering the high prevalence and mortality of breast cancer in postmenopausal women (15) and given that the population of Iran is aging (16) and considering the contradictory results of previous research in this field in Iran (17–19) and the fact that women in Jahrom have special religious and cultural characteristics that can affect their participation in breast cancer screening programs, this study was conducted to investigate the knowledge and attitude of postmenopausal women in Jahrom regarding breast cancer screening.	Page: 2 Line Number: 54-56
	1. While the definition of middle age is 45 to 60 years, why authors recruited women with ages range 45-89?	The target group was all menopausal women In this study, we tried to include all people who are approximately the age of menopause in the study	Page: 2 Line Number: 64
	2. How authors selected these women randomly, please explain?	It was explained	Page: 2 Line Number: 67-68
	In the assessment of the knowledge, the authors should have added an item under the name of "I do not know".	In this study, the standard questionnaire was used and this defect was mentioned in the study limitations	Page: 5 Line Number: 183-184
	4. There is a lack of enough information about the method, e.g. how participants completed the questionnaires? By interview or self-completed? How many women were screened till authors reached the eligible women?	added	Page: 2 Line Number: 65-70

	5. What was the response rate in this study?	added	Page: 2 Line Number: 90-92
	1. Table 1 should be the demographic characteristics of participants.	added	Page: 3 Line Number: 108-110
	2. Table 2: Why authors reported a p-value for any items in the "source of information"? You should use the Chi-Square test for this matter and just report one p-value.	corrected	Page: 3-4 Line Number: 117-119
	3. And also for a history of breast disease, you should not have three p values.	corrected	Page: 3-4 Line Number: 117-119

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) — 21 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Corrections that are made are acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear EIC,
All corrections were made. this manuscript is acceptable.
With the best.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear Author,
I think all comments have made and this manuscript in the current format is acceptable.
Truly Yours.