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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.100390
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(2); e100390

Peer Review Report for "Iranian Version of the Quality of Life in Adult Cancer Survivors (QLACS) Questionnaire: Examining Face and Content Validity, Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability"

Author(s): Fariba Fathollahi-Dehkordi, Ziba Farajzadegan, Simin Hematti, Narges Motamedi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Dec 2019
Revised Date:	30 May 2020
Accepted Date:	3 Jun 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) — 6 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
1. The QLACS questionnaire includes 48 items. One item was deleted in the face validity stage and nine items were deleted in the content validity stage. Why construct validity was conducted on 37 items?
2. $P<0.001$ is true.
3. EFA is necessary but is not enough. You must also perform CFA.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Apr 2020

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

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Apr 2020

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

Dear editor

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions.

comment	responce
The QLACS questionnaire includes 48 items. One item was deleted in face validity stage and nine items were deleted in content validity stage. Why construct validity was conducted on 37 items?	*The QLACS questionnaire includes 47 items. We had a spelling mistake. It was corrected*
EFA is necessary but is not enough. You must also perform CFA	It is absolutely correct that CFA must be done. But the aim of this article was QLACS face, content and EFA validity explanation. QLACS CFA explanation will be provided in the form of another article. So article title was corrected.

We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Acceptable for publication after the minor changes.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 May 2020

Dear Authors,
There is need for revision as mentioned by AE in the comments on the manuscript.
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.

reviewers' comments	Reply by the author(s)
Comment 1: use	Changed: used
Comment 2: years of old	Changed: years old
Comment 3: An abstract for this article is published in proceeding of a congress (women's health promotion). You have to mention this in this section.	Was done : Ethical and Legal Considerations: An abstract for this article is published in proceeding of a congress (women's health promotion).
Comment 4: Write it (CVR,CVI) completely below table	Was done

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 Jun 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.