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

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.100223
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(3); e100223

Peer Review Report for "Contribution Value of Akt, c-Myc, CIP2A, and PP2A Genes Expression in Leukemogenesis: A Bright Perspective on the Molecular Pattern of Patients with Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML)"

Author(s): Mohammad Sayyadi, Ava Safaroghli-Azar, Somayeh Rabiemajd, Mojtaba Didehdar, Hassan Abolghasemi, Ali Arash Anoushirvani, Davood Bashash

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Dec 2019
Revised Date:	5 Jan 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Jan 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 31 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the author:
1- The manuscript needs to be edited by a person familiar to the English.
2- The authors should mention what were the inclusion and exclusion criteria to select the cases and controls.
3- The authors used the LIvak method to analyze the data of the qPCR. Why the authors did not use the pfaffl method which is more accurate than Livak method?
4- The authors should express that whether they match the demographic characteristics of the cases and controls in the study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 31 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. Please revise it according to the associate editor's comments. In addition, 1. add the ORCID ID of the first and main authors, 2. add a conclusion section to the end of the manuscript.
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 you for the email dated 31 December 2019, and the opportunity to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript **100223** entitled ***"Contribution value of Akt, c-Myc, CIP2A and PP2A genes expression in leukemogenesis: a bright perspective on the molecular pattern of patients with acute myeloid leukemia (AML)"***. We also appreciated the positive feedback and helpful comments of the reviewers. The manuscript has been revised to address the comments, which are appended alongside our responses to this letter.

Sincerely yours

Reviewer 1:

1- The manuscript needs to be edited by a person familiar to the English.

- ✓ The manuscript has been edited by the native English speaker.

2- The authors should mention what were the inclusion and exclusion criteria to select the cases and controls.

- ❖ **Inclusion criteria**
  - ✓ The prerequisite for patients to enter the study was primary AML that were morphologically confirmed by the oncologist given to the presence of more than 20% of myeloid blasts in their bone marrow samples. In terms of risk stratification, all cases were divided into two groups: M3 and Non-M3. The age range was not significant and included both adults and children.
  - ✓ Control group do not have any hematological or underlying (Acute or chronic) diseases and are apparently healthy individuals who do not take medication. Gender and age range in both groups (patients and controls) were same.
- ❖ **Exclusion criteria**
  - ✓ Exclusion criteria included bi-phenotype AML, secondary AML (MDS-related AML), and consumption of any type of chemotherapy drug, relapse sample and low sample quality.

3- The authors used the LIvak method to analysis the data of the qPCR. Why the authors did not use the pfaffl method which is more accurate than Livak method?

- ✓ For each target gene, primer efficiency was estimated from a standard curve using four consecutive 1, 1:10, 1:100, 1:1000 dilutions of cDNA sample. Since the efficiency of each primer was **between 0.95 and 1.1**, we therefore used the Livak formula.

4- The authors should express that whether they match the demographic characteristics of the cases and controls in the study.

- ✓ In order to match the demographic characteristics of the cases and controls in the present study, the following criteria were considered:
  - The mean age of the patients at the time of diagnosis was ~56 years (age range 19-85).The mean age of control group ~54 years (age range 20-79).
  - Since 56% of the samples (16 out of 30) were collected from male and 44% of the samples (14 out of 30) were allocated to female patients, in the control group, 60% and 40% of samples were collected from healthy male (6 out of 10) and female (4 out of 10) volunteers, respectively.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
here are some comments to the author:
1- The English of the manuscript needs to be revised. The sentences should be written with the better format.
2- The response to the questions 2 and 4 should be added to the text of the manuscript. The authors did not add them to the text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
This is my pleasure to announce to you that your article has been accepted by the editorial committee after peer review in the International Journal of Cancer Management (IJCM). Hopefully, it will be published in future issues.
Thanks.