Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Volume 22 · Issue 11 · e111304

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Demographic and Socio-cultural Determinants of Intended and Unintended Pregnancies Among Women Under Cancer Treatment in Sistan and Baluchestan Province, Iran

Khadijeh Asadisarvestani, Maryam Navaee

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 Nov 2020	27 Apr 2021	30 Apr 2021	10.5812/semj.111304

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** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 11
4 **Revision 3** 12
Authors' reply to reviewers 13
Reviewer and editor comments 15
5 **Revision 4** 16
Authors' reply to reviewers 17
Reviewer and editor comments 18

1 Original submission

2 comments · 9 Jan 2021 – 10 Jan 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 9 Jan 2021

Dear editorial team ,I greatly appreciate your kind reply to me and your selection of me to review this manuscript.
This is a very good manuscript.
dear autors ,thank you for submitting your beneficial manuscript to this journal.
a) You can delete table_2 because its content is discussed in the text of the article.
b) Some grammatical corrections are necessary.
–

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jan 2021

This is a well-written manuscript with a practical topic that needs major revision to be suitable for publication.
The Abstract is long.
Please add the ethical considerations.
It seems that some information has been repeated in the results, which should be revised.
Add a comment about the strengths of the current study.

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.

26.01.2021 **ID: 111304**

Dear Professor Lankarani and Reviewers

First of all, really thanks for your valuable and useful comments. We tried to improve the article according to your comments. Please inform me if you find any problem. The Following tables (the next page) show changes in the article. In addition, the changes are highlighted in the article.

Best Regards

Reviewers' Comments (1)	Reply
1. Report exact P-value in the abstract.	Done
2. There was no information about sample size calculation.	Added
3. Report descriptive statistics as number (%).	Done
4. In Tables 1 and 2, report demographic variables for each group and compare groups.	It was not clear to us because we tried to describe the most important part of the table.
5. Report very small P-values as <0.001	
6. Transfer the following to the methods: “The odds ratio (OR) was measured at a 95% confidence interval (CI). The maximum likelihood method was used to estimate the coefficients of logistic regression models. All variables with a P-value less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Also, the fitness of the proposed models was assessed using different goodness-of-fit indices, including the Hosmer-Lemeshow (H-L) test and goodness-of-fit measures such as Cox-Snell, R2 and Nagelkerke R2 (Garson).”	Done
7. In Table 3, report number (%).	Done
8. Revise title of Table 4. Replace sig by “P-value”, exp(B) by “OR” and remove Wald column.	Done

Reviewers' Comments (1)	Reply
you can delete table_2 because content of that discuss in text of article	Please let us keep it because think can provide more clear description for readers.
b)some correction of gramatic point is necessary	It checked. In addition, certificated attached

Reviewers' Comments (3)	Reply

1- The title should be more clear	done
2- The abstract is too long. Some information are not necessary to be mentioned in this part e.g. the SPSS tests that were used for analysis	The words declined from around 370 words to around 270
b)some correction of grammatical point is necessary	It checked. In addition, certificated attached

Associate Editor's Comments:	Reply
The Abstract is long.	The words declined from around 370 words to around 270
Please add the ethical consideration.	done
It seems that some information has been repeated in the result, which should be which should be revised.	The repeated information in the results part was deleted.
Add a comment about the strengths of the current study.	Both strengths and limitations were added.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 25 Feb 2021

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 25 Feb 2021

The title has become informative, but it is long.
Please merge the two paragraphs that explain the limitations of the study.

3

Revision 2

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.

26.02.2021 **ID: 111304**

Dear Professor Lankarani and Reviewers

First of all, really thanks for your valuable and useful comments. We tried to improve the article according to your comments. Please inform me if you find any problem. The Following tables (the next page) show changes in the article. In addition, the changes are highlighted in the article.

Best Regards

Reviewers' Comments (1)	Reply
Report descriptive statistics as number (%)	Done
In Tables 1 and 2, report demographic variables for each group and compare groups (Women With and Without Experience of Pregnancy).	I respect your opinion, but please let me keep the format of tables 1 and 2 because in Table 3 we compared women with and without pregnancy based on demographic and socio-cultural factors.
Associate Editor's Comments:	Reply
The title has become informative but it is long. .	The title of the article became shorter .
Please merge two paragraphs that explained the limitation of the study.	Done

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 15 Mar 2021

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Mar 2021

The presentation of the results needs to be revised. The content, especially the numbers, is repeated in both the tables and the text. Please present all the numbers and statistical comparisons and tests in the tables, with their interpretation in the text, referring to the tables.

4

Revision 3

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.

03.04.2021 **ID: 111304**

Dear Professor Lankarani and Reviewers

Many thanks for your valuable and useful comments. We tried to improve the article according to your comments. Please inform me if you find any problem. The Following tables (the next page) show changes in the article. In addition, the changes are highlighted in the article.

Best Regards

Khadijeh Asadi

Reviewrs' Comments (1)	Reply
The title needs to be revised . The term some should be deleted	Done
The result writing needs to be revised. The content, especially the numbers, is repeated in both tables and text. Please mention all the numbers and statistical comparisons and tests in tables with their interpretation in text with referring to table.	Done

4 Revision 3

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

5

Revision 4

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.

24.04.2021 **ID: 111304**

Dear Professor Lankarani and Reviewers

Many thanks for your valuable and useful comments. We tried to improve the article according to your comments. Please inform me if you find any problem. The Following tables (the next page) show changes in the article. In addition, the changes are highlighted in the article.

Best Regards

Reviewers'' Comments (1)	Reply	Line N
Report descriptive statistics as number (%)in the results	We described statistics as frequency (%). However, please let me explain that previously we reported the results as frequency (%) but please let me explain that statistical consultant of the journal asked us to remove number because he/she believed that is repeat of tables' content.	109-135
In Tables 1 and 2, report demographic variables for each group and compare groups (Women With and Without Experience of Pregnancy).	Please let me explain that we have tried to compare demographic variable of women with and without pregnancy during the treatment in Table 3 and we think if we do it for table 1 and 2 is only the repeat of results. So, please let us to keep it in the current format.	163-177

5 Revision 4

0 comments

No public comments in this round.