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.95732
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 8(4); e95732

Peer Review Report for "Cancers of Urinary System; Prevalence, Demographic"

Author(s): Zahra Tolou Ghamari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 5 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 4 Oct 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) — 1 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for submitting this valuable manuscript to the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Care Disease. This paper needs a minor revision in some sections are as follow;
1. The importance of research and the main gap is not expressed well.
2. How different is your finding with others?
3. What are the implications of your results?
We are waiting for your revised article.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for submitting this nice manuscript in the JJCDC. The study is very important in chronic diseases. I have some comments that the author can mention it:
• Please check your Keywords with Mesh data base. It seems that the keywords need some revisions
• Result of the abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings.
• Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.
• Design of study has not explained clearly. about your kind of review.

• What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your exclusion study criteria?
• There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
• Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.
Thank you very much.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the author for submitting the manuscript in JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I recommend him to revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript in JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in some parts of it. 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.

In the Name of Almighty

To the Editor in Chief of the Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care

Dr. Kourosh Zarea

:The manuscript ID: 95732 titled as

Cancers of Urinary System; Prevalence, Demographic

Was revised according to the comments received from the editorial office. The final revised version of the file has been attached and re-submitted through the journal site. If there is any problem please let me know ASAP. I am looking forward to hear from you.

Sincerely Yours

Reviewer 1:

'Reply to Reviewers No1 Comments

Please check your Keywords with Mesh data base. It seems that the (1 keywords need some revisions

.**Authors' Answer:** Authors appreciated the comment

As suggested the key words was modified. In the revised version of file that has been submitted through site, the new keywords are as follow; Urinary system; Cancer; Kidney; Bladder; Prevalence; Iran.

2) Result of the abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings.

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment. As suggested the conclusion was changed with more detailed information in abstract section.

The PP for urinary system cancers in male population was 3.7 times higher than females. There was a 23.2% increase in the Irs over the study period. These findings highlighted the advantage of given a focus on the risk of urinary systems diseases, its'evidence based pharmacotherapy and surgery management of such patients. To this process, providing clinically drug-management has the potential importance in Iran.

3) Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment. As suggested the novelty and the importance of such study was mentioned at the end of introduction section as follow; As the essential knowledge of public health strategy, the use of epidemiologic information associated with urinary systems, is the need to provide a wisdom of forthcoming to set significances

in causing disease and its' pharmacotherapy management. As there is considerable variation in the distribution of diseases worldwide, therefore the aim of this study was to show up-to-date estimates of crude rate, incidence rates and differences in rates between men and women of urinary system cancer in Isfahan/Iran.

4) Design of study has not explained clearly. about your kind of review.

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment. As suggested the requested change was done in method section.

This retrospective study was conducted to the Isfahan Kidney Transplantation Research Center (IKTRC) and approved by the Isfahan Deputy of Research Committee via the Ethics Committee Code Number of 295115… .

***5*) What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your exclusion study criteria?**

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment. As suggested the requested change was done in method section.

All cancers were defined by topography code. For example kidney was defined by topography code C64, renal pelvis by topography code C65, ureter by topography code C66 and bladder by topography code C67. There was not any exclusion criterion. De-identified patient name and surname, demographic

6) There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment. The spelling gramma was checked through: http://www.reverso.net/spell-checker/english-spelling-grammar/

7) Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.

Authors appreciated the comment. An appropriate judgment and discussion about the trends and changes are needed to investigate the incidence of

urologic cancers over time. For future plan additional research toward drug-management associated with urinary system cancers in Iran recommended.

Authors' Answer: Authors appreciated the comment.

Reviewer 2:

'Reply to Reviewers No2 Comments

1) The importance of research and the main gap is not expressed well.

Authors appreciated the comment. As suggested the importance of such study was mentioned at the end of introduction section as follow; As the essential knowledge of public health strategy, the use of epidemiologic information associated with urinary systems, is the need to provide a wisdom of forthcoming to set significances in causing disease and its' pharmacotherapy management. As there is considerable variation in the distribution of diseases worldwide, therefore the aim of this study was to show up-to-date estimates of crude rate, incidence rates and differences in rates between men and women of urinary system cancer in Isfahan/Iran.

2) How different is your finding with others?

Authors appreciated the comment. In agreement with previous study of Western countries in which specified an increasing trend toward incidence of

urinary bladder and kidney cancers,[1] in this study incidence of urinary system cancers 23.2% was increased between 2011 and 2015.

The result of this study is in agreement with the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report that confirmed bladder cancer as the most common cancers with a rise in incidence.

3) What are the implications of your results?

Authors appreciated the comment. The implications of this investigation could be mentioned as following suggestions: 1) Health care system should provide model-base-strategy to improve access to specialized medical, pharmacological and surgical facilities 2) Consideration needed toward the reality for scheduling health system improvements, particularly referral systems 3) Preventing of significant difficulties by management equality for patient satisfaction 4) Attention toward financial management by study of epidemiology and pharmacotherapy.

Thanks for your valuable suggestion for improving the submitted manuscript.

Sincerely Your

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) — 4 Oct 2019

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 4 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable in the current format.
Thank you

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 4 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your nice paper to JJCDC. I appreciate your consideration of our journal. we wait for a nice future manuscript.
Thank you very much indeed.
Dr. Zarea