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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.112038
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 19(1); e112038

Peer Review Report for "The Emerging Impact of RNA Editing in Tumor Growth and Metastasis"

Author(s): Mehrdad Nasrollahzadehsabet, Javad Behroozi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 30 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 10 Feb 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)

20 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- The novelty of work is low and there are many powerful reviews in this case.
2- This work is a brief review and the organization is totally wrong. This manuscript doesn't have results and other sections related to the original article.
3- The author search just 2 keywords in PubMed and science direct and summarized them. The searching keywords are deficient.
4- The manuscript was written badly, and there are many errors.
5- There are not organized subsections related to the title of the manuscript.
6- The author should provide at least a table about different mechanisms of RNA editing in different cancers with separate references.
7- The role of miRNA in cancer development and cancer inhibition in different cancers should be organized at a table.
8- The schematic representation of figures is very simple, and it's better to use other studies with permission.
9- This manuscript should be totally revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

23 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The subject of this manuscript is interesting and up-to-date and has relatively fluent and eloquent writing. I have a few suggestions for improving it.
1- The title chosen for this manuscript is very similar to the existing published articles. It is better to use a little initiative and innovation in the title of it.
2- In the text of the manuscript, there are many summary phrases or acronyms, which are often related to the names of different genres. For easier understanding of the subject by the reader, it is better to include the full phrase of the summary forms.
3- Section 3.3 of this manuscript describes the importance of RNA editing in tumor formation, tumor inhibition, and its effect on microRNAs. It seems better to use a separate subheading for each of these cases.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. The text needs to be grammatically revised, especially the tense of verbs must be corrected.
2. The gene names should be changed in the italic format in the whole manuscript.
3. The discussion and conclusion sections need to be extended.
Thanks.

Rohallah Mirjani: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Dec 2020

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

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (0) 9 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
The references are not in Journal format.
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.

20 January 2021

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah
Editor-in-Chief
Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research

Dear Dr. Mirzaii-Dizgah,

On behalf of my co-authors, I submit the revised manuscript entitled "**The emerging impact of RNA editing in tumor growth and metastasis**". Please find in the next pages the responses to the reviewers' comments. We have addressed all of the comments and revised the manuscript accordingly.

We want to thank the reviewers for their important input. We believe their suggested changes have helped to improve the quality of this paper over the previous version.

Thank you for the opportunity to have this work considered for publication in *Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research*. We look forward to the outcome of your assessment.

Sincerely Yours

Reviewer 1:

Q: The text needs to be grammatically revised, especially the tense of verbs must be corrected.

R: We thank the reviewer for their careful reading of the manuscript. We corrected the grammatical and spelling mistakes.

Q: The gene names should be changed in the italic format in the whole manuscript.

R: Thank you for raising this point. All gene names changed to the italic format.

Q: The discussion and conclusion sections need to be extended.

R: Thank you for your helpful comment. We have revised our paper accordingly and feel that your comments helped clarify and improve our paper.

Reviewer 2:

Q: This work is a brief review and the organization is totally wrong. This manuscript doesn't have results and other sections related to the original article.

R: We understand the concern raised by the reviewer. The manuscript was organized according to instructions of AMSHR journal.

Q: The manuscript was written badly, and there are many errors.

R: We thank the reviewer for their careful reading of the manuscript. We revised our manuscript.

Q: There are not organized subsections related to the title of the manuscript.

R: Thank you for raising this point. We have revised our paper accordingly and divided it into subsections.

Q: The schematic representation of figures is very simple, and it's better to use other studies with permission.

R: The schematic representation are designed by ourselves and we prefer to use genuine pictures instead of using from published papers.

Q: This manuscript should be totally revised.

R: We revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.

Reviewer 3:

The subject of this manuscript is interesting and up-to-date and has a relatively fluent and eloquent writing. I have a few suggestions for improving it.

Q: The title chosen for this manuscript is very similar to the existing published articles. It is better to use a little initiative and innovation in the title of it.

R: We thank the reviewer for this constructive comment. We revised the paper title to "*The emerging impact of RNA editing in tumor growth and metastasis*".

Q: In the text of the manuscript, there are many summary phrases or acronyms, which are often related to the names of different genes. For easier understanding of the subject by the reader, it is better to include the full phrase of the summary forms.

R: We thank the reviewer for their careful reading of the manuscript. The full form of all phrases and acronyms were added to the manuscripts.

Q: Section 3.3 of this manuscript describes the importance of RNA editing in tumor formation, tumor inhibition, and its effect on microRNAs. It seems better to use a separate subheading for each of these cases.

R: Thank you for raising this point. We have revised our paper accordingly and feel that your comments helped clarify and improve our paper.

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) — 3 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript can be accepted in the new format.
Thanks.

Rohallah Mirjani: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 8 Feb 2021

Dear EIC
the revised version of the manuscript fulfilled the Reviewers demands so it should be considered for publishing in AMHSR
best regards.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 10 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.