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

Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases
Article DOI: 10.5812/archcid.98922
Published in: Archives of Clinical Infectious Diseases: 15(4); e98922

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Cancers Among Patients with HIV Referring to Voluntary Counseling and Testing Center, Tehran, Iran, 2004-2017"

Author(s): Zeinab Talebi Tamajani , Maryam Gorji, Omid Dadras, Zeinab Najafi, Jeno Martin, Roberto Carlos Vieira Junior, SeyedAhmad SeyedAlinaghi, Fabricio Azevedo Voltarelli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	19 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	23 Aug 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Minoosh Shabani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
- The setting, locations, and relevant dates, including data collection about malignancies have not been mentioned.
- A part of the second paragraph of " Study design and participants" has been refered to 14th reference that is not compatible with its contents!
- Confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval) has not been mentioned
- Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included
- The results cannot be accurate because some hiv positive patients -who are under supervision of this center- are not able to do evaluations for malignancy because of financial problems.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards

Masoud Mardani: EIC | **Revision (0)** 21 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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

We would like to thank the reviewers and the editor for their highly constructive feedback. We have found these comments to be very useful to increase the clarity and content of the paper. We have addressed each individual comment below and have made associated changes in the manuscript, which we have highlighted in green color.

Reviewer 1:
1. See Confidential Comments

Response1: Thanks.

Reviewer 2:
1. The setting, locations, and relevant dates, including data collection about malignancies has not been mentioned

Response 1: It was done and determined by green color.

2. A part of second paragraph of "Study design and participants" has been referred to 14th reference that is not compatible with it's contents !

Response 2: It is corrected, thank you.

3. confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval) has not been mentioned.

Response 3: Thanks for the note. The aim of this study was a descriptive study to determine the prevalence of cancer among people living with HIV and then if possible, the relationship between cancer and relevant factors. So, based on the comment of respected reviewer, the bivariate analyses were performed and reporting the crude odds ratios (OR). Subsequently, the adjusted odds ratios (AOR) were calculated using logistic regression model to account for the potential confounding effects of different factors. Variables associated with cancer in bivariate analysis at the $P \leq 0.10$ level were included as potential independent predictors. The final model retained those variables associated with cancer at the $P<0.05$ level.

4. Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included

Response 4: Please return to the previous response (no. 3) as well as Table 1 and 2 in the manuscript. Thanks

5. The results cannot be accurate because some HIV positive patients -who are under supervision of this center- are not able to do evaluations for malignancy because of financial problems

Response 5: Thanks, although our results can be somewhat underestimated, but this hospital is a governmental and referral hospital that provides the patients with government services at a cheaper price. On the other hand, the help section (Madadkary) has the necessary cooperation with the patients to get a significant discount. Also, the Positive Club pays for some of the costs of co-morbidities. More importantly, since having cancer at the same time can greatly affect the progression of HIV infection, most people with the condition try to seek further examination if necessary, even if it is by getting a loan.

Finally, Mr.Alireza Barzegary had a significant contribution for the responses to the respected reviewers, so please add his name as “fifth author” in this manuscript.

Best Regards

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.

Masoud Mardani: EIC | **Revision (1)** 23 Aug 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.