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

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.109725
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(4); e109725

Peer Review Report for "Lectin Histochemical Detection of N-Acetyl Glucosamine and L-Fucose Containing glycoconjugates in Lung Carcinoma"

Author(s): Abbas Ali Niazi, Mohammad Hossein Heidari, Yousef Arab, Maryam Arab, Mohammad Reza Arab, Narjes Sargolzaei, Sima Tavakolinezhad, Fereydoon Sargolzaeiaval

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 12 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Oct 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) 27 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Concerning the manuscript entitled “Lectin histochemical detection of N-Acetyl glucosamine and LFucose containing glycoconjugates in lung carcinoma". This study presents results about the detect N – acetyl glucosamine (GlcNac) and L- fucose (L-fuc) containing glycoconjugates in different types of lung cancer. However, I have the following specific concerns with this particular study as follow for the authors:
1. English editing in terms of grammar checking and usage of academic words is highly recommended (such as categorized instead of grouped).
2. What samples did the authors use as a positive control in this study?
3. In figure 1, which variable has represented in the horizontal axis?
4. In Figures 1 and 2, the axes do not have a title.
5. Why the authors did not indicate the exact differences between groups in the text?
6. The results should be written clearly and concisely to represent the acquired data of the current study.
7. Why the authors did not mention the histopathologic parameters and correlation of that with glycoprotein detection in the examined types of cancers?

8. In the discussion, the authors indicated that " The study of Chen et al showed that expression of B7H3 is significantly upregulated in 130 tumors of oral squamous cell carcinoma patients, and also, correlates with tumor size, 131 advanced stages, and poor prognosis" what causes the different result in comparison with the current study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The review will be sent to your service as follows:
1- In the result section of line 107, it should be corrected as follows:
With mann whitney test and SBA lectin ….
2- In the references section, the name of the journal should be summarized.
3- There is nothing wrong with writing the article in English.
In general, I think the text of the article is very good.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
- It is recommended to write the Keywords (Lung cancer, histochemistry, lectin) exactly as Mesh.
- Why are two types of lectin antibodies used? Please explain this in the method section.
- The vertical and horizontal axis units of graphs should be specified.
- The magnification of histopathologic figures should be specified.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
This manuscript discusses Lectin histochemical detection of N-Acetyl glucosamine and LFucose containing glycoconjugates in different types of lung carcinoma".
Based on the reviewers and as I read it needs major revisions in result part and figures and also English language and grammar checking. Thus the author must revise it precisely and also reply to the reviewers comments point by point.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers and AE comments this manuscript needs major revisions specially in result part and figures and also English language and grammar checking. Thus the author must revise it precisely and also reply to the reviewers comments point by point.
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 are very grateful for the valuable comments of reviewers and you. There are the answers to comments as bellow:

Reviewer 1:

1. English editing in terms of grammar checking and usage of academic words is highly recommended (such as categorized instead of grouped).

The manuscript revised according to your suggestion.

2. What samples did the authors use as a positive control in this study?

Parallel control sections were used for each patient under the same protocol, except that incubation was not performed with lectins or DAB.

3. In figure 1, which variable has represented in the horizontal axis?

The variables description added to figure legend.

4. In Figures 1 and 2, the axes do not have a title.

The titles added to figures.

5. Why the authors did not indicate the exact differences between groups in the text?

The explanation added to manuscript.

6. The results should be written clearly and concisely to represent the acquired data of the current study.

The results revised according to your suggestion.

7. Why the authors did not mention the histopathologic parameters and correlation of that with glycoprotein detection in the examined types of cancers?

The explanation added to the introduction part.

8. In the discussion, the authors indicated that " The study of Chen et al showed that expression of B7H3 is significantly upregulated in 130 tumors of oral squamous cell carcinoma patients, and also, correlates with tumor size, 131 advanced stages, and poor prognosis" what causes the different result in comparison with the current study?

We did not examine the expression of glycoprotein in the current study.

Reviewer 2:
It is recommended to write the Key words (Lung cancer, histochemistry, lectin) exactly as Mesh.

The keywords revised according to your suggestion.

Why are two types of lectin antibodies used? Please explain about this in the method section.
The explanation added to method section.

The vertical and horizontal axis units of graphs should be specified.
The graph titles specified according to your suggestion.

The magnification of histopathologic figures should be specified.

The figures were changed to 300 dpi quality.

Reviewer 3:

1-In the result section of line 107,it should be corrected as follows:With mann whitney test and SBA lectin ….

The sentences revised according to your comment.

2- In the references section, the name of the journal should be summarized.

The .enl file added to submission files and references were set according to journal style.

3- There is nothing wrong with writing the article in English.
In general, I think the text of the article is very good.

Thank you for your valuable comments.

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) 8 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript was reviewed. Thanks for all the objections that were applied and the article was accepted by me.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 10 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Considering that the manuscript entitled" Lectin Histochemical Detection of N-Acetyl Glucosamine and LFucose Containing glycoconjugates in Lung Carcinoma" had a peer review in the previous version, I reviewed the sections modified by the author in response to the reviewers. It should point out that some issues must be revised by the authors.
1. There are some grammatical errors in text like line 12 in the abstract "were" should be replaced with "was" and "have been shown" in the introduction.
2. Please add the scale bar to the histopathologic figures and also specify the magnification in the figure legend.
3. Please mark the charts that have a significant difference with hashtag or asterisk.
4. Please highlight the revised part in results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I think the modifications are acceptable.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers comments and as I read revisions were done well. But minor revisions still must be done and reply to the comments is needed prior acceptance for the publication in GCT.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision (1)** 12 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers comments and as I read revisions were done. But still some revisions must be done and reply to the comments is needed.
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.

Dear Editor

We are very grateful for the valuable comments of reviewers and you. There are the answers to comments as bellow:

Reviewer 1:
1. There are some grammatical errors in text like line 12 in the abstract "were" should be replaced with "was" and "have been shown" in the introduction.

The error was revised.

2. Please add the scale bar to the histopathologic figures and also specify the magnification in the figure legend.

The scale bar and the magnification was specified in figure legend.

3. Please mark the charts that have a significant difference with hashtag or asterisk.

The significant difference was marked by asterisk.

4. Please highlight the revised part in results.

The result was highlighted.

Reviewer 2:
Hi Dear Author
The manuscript was reviewed. Thanks for all the objections were applied and your article was accepted by me.
Thanks a lot.

Reviewer 3:
Dear Editor,
I think the modifications are acceptable.

Thanks a lot.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript and reviewed the sections modified by the author in response to the reviewers. This version is suitable for acceptance.
bests,

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 19 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewer comments and as I read revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (2) 19 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers' comments and as I read revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks