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

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon.111618
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 21(1); e111618

Peer Review Report for "Hepatitis B Virus preS2 Domain Promotes Angiogenesis in Hepatocellular Carcinoma via Transcriptional Activation of VEGFA Promoter"

Author(s): Fang Luan, Bin Liu, Xiangrui Guo, Wang Yong

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 10 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 4 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) 11 Dec 2020

Dear AE,

the manuscript is written well. however there are some defects:

- introduction should be updated by using more recent data about the subject.

- methods should be revised by using more accurate used procedures

- discussion should be revised by using more recent data, comparison of findings and deep discussion about differences, and adding limitations before conclusion.

- references should be updated and changed by recent 2 years at least for half of them.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2020

Dear editor,

In this manuscript, authors analyzed Hepatitis B virus preS2 domain promotes angiogenesis in hepatocellular carcinoma via its transcriptional activation of VEGFA promoter. Totally, the manuscript is well organized and has notable novelty. However, it needs some minor revisions as follow:

1. The manuscript needs an extensive review of the English-language usage, grammar and style. Sometimes it is quite difficult to follow the author's ideas. Without an extensive review it will not be possible to perform a fully evaluation of the scientific merit of this manuscript.

2. It is necessary that the inclusion or exclusion criteria added to MS.

3. Please describe the statistical analysis more in detail.

4. The authors mentioned to the discussion in the result section, 178 and 184 lines in page number 8, it is recommend that these parts must be moved to discussion section.

5. The discussion section briefly written, it is recommend that expand your results and compare them with the results of other articles.

6. It lacks limitations of the study.

7. Guidance for future research should be provided based on the outcomes of the present study.

Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript # 111618 entitled, "Hepatitis B virus preS2 domain promotes angiogenesis in hepatocellular carcinoma via its transcriptional activation of VEGFA promoter" was evaluated by two experts. While the manuscript was recognized as a good report for publication in HM but some comments are raised that should be addressed by authors in a new revision before acceptance for publication.

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2020

Dear Authors,

Based on the peer-review process, your manuscript needs a major revision.

Regards,
EIC

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 and reviewers,

Thank you very much for your encouraging letter together with the reviewers' constructive critiques regarding our manuscript. As you suggested, we have revised the manuscript, according to the comments and suggestions of reviewers and editor, and responded, point by point, to the comments as listed below. Major changes are highlighted in the revised manuscript.

Responses to Reviewer 1's Comments

Thank you for your constructive review. The manuscript has been carefully revised. And the following are responses to the specific comments.

1. ***introduction should be updated by using more recent data about the subject.***

Response: Introduction has been updated by more recent data.

2. ***methods should be revised by using more accurate used procedures***

Response: Methods has been be revised by using more detailed procedures.

3. ***discussion should be revised by using more recent data, comparison of findings and deep discussion about differences, and adding limitations before conclusion.***

Response: Discussion has been revised according to the reviewer's suggestion.

4. ***references should be updated and changed by recent 2 years at least for half of them.***

Response: References has been updated.

Responses to Reviewer 2's Comments

Thank you for your insightful comments on our work. The manuscript has been carefully revised. And the following are responses to the specific comments.

1. ***The manuscript needs an extensive review of the English-language usage, grammar and style. Sometimes it is quite difficult to follow the author's ideas. Without an extensive review it will not be possible to perform a fully evaluation of the scientific merit of this manuscript.***

Response: The manuscript has been polished thoroughly.

2. ***It is necessary that the inclusion or exclusion criteria added to MS.***

   Response: Inclusion criteria has been be added in the method section.

3. ***Please describe the statistical analysis more in detail.***

   Response: The statistical analysis has been described in detail.

4. ***The authors mentioned to the discussion in the result section, 178 and 184 lines in page number 8, it is recommend that these parts must be moved to discussion section.***

   Response: The discussion in the result section has be moved to discussion section.

5. ***The discussion section briefly written, it is recommend that expand your results and compare them with the results of other articles. It lacks limitations of the study. Guidance for future research should be provided based on the outcomes of the present study.***

   Response: Discussion has been revised according to the reviewer's suggestion.

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) 23 Jan 2021

Dear AE,

all changes regard to comments were applied.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 27 Jan 2021

Dear editor,

The requested changes were appropriate and carried out.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,

Authors properly addressed the comments of the reviewers in their revised version of the manuscript. The manuscript might be accepted for publication.

Thanks

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Feb 2021

Dear Authors,

We are delighted to inform you that your manuscript is accepted for publication in Hepatitis Monthly.

Regards,