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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.101486
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(12); e101486

Peer Review Report for "The Identification of Cytochrome B5 Reductase 2 and Fructose-1,6-Bisphosphatase 1 Proteins in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: Proteomics Approach"

Author(s): Zahra Najafi, Abdolreza Mohamadnia, Rahim Ahmadi, Minoo Mahmoodi, Naghmeh Bahrami, Adnan Khosravi, Hamid Reza Jamaati, Payam Tabarsi, Mehdi Kazempour Dizaji, Alireza Mosavi Jarrahi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 25 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 26 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) 21 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should consider the following comments in your manuscript.
1. Statistics on lung cancer in Iran in the introduction report.
2. Explain how cancer cell and natural phenotype are proteomic in the introduction
3. The purpose of examining proteomes is wrong. The purpose is to study proteins
4. Number of clients 30 or 60? The sampling location is not known. The entry and exit criteria
for studying individuals are not known
5. Mention the definitive diagnosis of tissue and cancer during sampling.
6. What software was used to compare the pair of gels?
7. What is the basis of spot analysis?
8. On what basis were the spots separated for mass?

9. There is no need for all this explanation for real-time in the method section
10. Pathological Status is not correct. It depends on the method of work, not the pathological
results
11. Proteomics s results should be mentioned, not the procedure? In fact, a few spots were found,
mentioning their type of expression?
12. The results are more of an explanation of the method, not the results!
13. A total of two proteins were found and mass investigated!!!!!
14. Method ΔΔCt Explain the working method.
15. Good discussion. Good conclusion and good referencing.
Thanks

Hakimeh Zali: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 May 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 May 2020

Dear author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the above comments and then resubmit.
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

.Thanks for your attention, I sent the answer of your *Reviewers comment*

Reviewer

:1

- Statistics on lung cancer:

According to available reports, the number of lung cancer patients among Iranian men and women is increasing (1). In a study of Iran, 4,361 deaths from lung cancer have been recorded, with 9.80% and 6.07% of all cancer deaths among men and women, respectively (2).

- Phenotype, proteomic:

Samples include both healthy and tumor sections of each patient, so after two-dimensional electrophoresis, a healthy protein pattern and tumor are obtained that are comparable point to point.

- Purpose is to study proteins: Was corrected

- Number of clients 30 or 60? The sampling location….. :

30 patients were selected by a specialist who was diagnosed with lung cancer. From each patient, tumor tissue was taken from the center and a sample of healthy tissue was taken from the margins. Therefore, the number of samples examined was 60. Sampling place of Masih Daneshvari Hospital, under the supervision of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, and Tissue samples were collected immediately after surgery.

-Mention the definitive diagnosis of tissue and cancer during sampling:

30 patients were selected by a specialist who was definitively diagnosed with lung cancer.

-software was used to compare the pair of gels:

Melani software was used to compare the pairs of gels in versions 3, 4 and 5.

- the basis of spot analysis :

The basis of protein point analysis on tumor and healthy gels is point-to-point comparison, and based on four changes include: increased expression, decreased expression, the presence or absence of proteins in healthy tissue relative to tumor tissue.

- basis were the spots separated for mass :

After examining the differences between tumor and healthy gels, as usual in all Proteomics laboratories in the world, the spots are identified and cut off from the gels, and for Mass, in Vial 0.5 ml Sent to Cinacolon Company for polypeptide detection using LCMS / MS method.

- There is no need for all this explanation for real time in the method section : Was corrected

- Pathological Status , method of work : Was corrected

- Proteomics s results should be mentioned :

More than 40 significant differences were observed in comparisons between tumor and healthy gels, but due to financial and currency problems, only a limited number of these differences were considered for research studies.

- The results are more of an explanation of the method : Was corrected

- A total of two proteins were found and mass investigated :

More than 40 significant differences were observed in comparisons between tumor and healthy gels, but due to financial and currency problems, In this study, only two proteins were investigated and reported.

- Method ΔΔCt Explain the working method : In the working method section, it was explained.

Associate Editor 1:

-title change: was changed

- Abstract change:

This sentence" The comparison of tissues was performed by proteomic investigations in patients with NSCLC" : was deleted

And these sentences were added: after preparing tissue samples, protein extraction was performed. In the next step, Two dimensional electrophoresis (2DE) and then Mass Spectrometry was performed. Finally, Real-Time RT-PCR was done.

In result, This sentence was added: Then Cytochrome B5 Reductase 2 (CYB5R2) and Fructose-1,6-Bisphosphate were detected. And it has been shown that these proteins down regulated in cancer tissue compared to healthy tissue.

- The last part of the introduction: Was corrected

- Image analysis: Was corrected

- Result, the proteomics :

More than 40 significant differences were observed in comparisons between tumor and healthy gels, but due to financial and currency problems, In this study, only two proteins were investigated and reported. And the continuation of the evaluation of spots will be done in other studies.

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) 27 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
1. In the summary section of the article, the method should mention the method of work, not the prevalence!
2. Note the difference in expression of proteins, for example, some of the 40 proteins had reduced expression.
3. On what basis were the spots selected for Mass?
4. Please Use newer articles in the article discussion section.
Thanks

Hakimeh Zali: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 27 Jul 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Jul 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments.
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

.Thanks for your attention, I sent the answer of your *Reviewers comment*

Reviewer

:1

- In the summary section of the article, the method should mention the method of work, not the prevalence!

Was corrected

On what basis were the spots selected for Mass ?

After examining the differences between tumor and healthy gels, as usual in all Proteomics laboratories in the world, the spots are identified and cut off from the gels, and for Mass, in Vial 0.5 ml Sent to Cinacolon Company for polypeptide detection using LCMS / MS method.

Associate Editor 1:

- Title is better to change the Identification of Cytochrome B5 Reductase 2 and Fructose-1,6-bisphosphatase1 proteins in Non-small cell lung cancer, Proteomics approach

Was corrected

- The reference in abstract must be deleted] :

Was corrected

- In methods of abstract must explain the method used in manuscript: 2de gel and mass spectrometry and real time PCR:

Was corrected

- The aim of study in the last sentence of introduction does not need title "2. Objectives: ". it must be deleted:

Was corrected

- Here used Melani software in all 3 versions 3, 4 and 5?

Melani software was used to compare the pairs of gels in versions 5.

- *Melani software was transfer to Image analysis.*

Was corrected

- *Performing must be deleted from" Performing Real-Time RT-PCR"*:

Was corrected

- *This title "Demographic information and method of work" is not sutable to describe the samples, please change.*

Was corrected

- *Two spot in 2Dgeles must be highlighted with the circle in both geles*

Was corrected

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) 14 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The desired changes have been made and the article has been approved for acceptance.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 Oct 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Oct 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's comments.
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

.Thanks for your attention, I sent the answer of your *Reviewers comment*

1. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, in the abstract and manuscript body, each one separartely.
2. All keywords should be selected from MeSH main heading terms which can be found at MeSH browser.

.This was corrected

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 20 Oct 2020

Dear authors,
Thank you for revising your manuscript. There are still some points that need consideration:
1. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, both in the abstract and manuscript body, each one separately; such as RT-PCR, LCMS / MS, and mRNA in the abstract , and WHO, NSCLC, CYB5R2, LCMS / MS , ...
2. In the keywords section, "expression" is not a MeSH term. At least 3 keywords should be provided.
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

.Thanks for your attention, I sent the answer of your *Reviewers comment*

1. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, in the abstract and manuscript body, each one separartely.
2. All keywords should be selected from MeSH main heading terms which can be found at MeSH browser.

All items were checked and corrected

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 26 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,

This is my pleasure to announce 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