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.102470
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(9); e102470

Peer Review Report for "Clinical Significance of Long Noncoding RNA-DC Expression in Acute Graft Versus Host Disease (AGVHD) Development"

Author(s): Leila Jafari, Abbas Hajifathali, Mohammad Hossein Mohammadi, Hamid Ghaedi, Mehdi Allahbakhshian Farsiani, Vahid Amiri, Maryam Sadat Hosseini, Elham Roshandel, Ahmad Gharehbaghian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	7 Apr 2020
Revised Date:	20 Jun 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Jun 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)

12 May 2020

Dear EIC,

Comments to the authors:

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

2- In the abstract, the authors wrote only one sentence about the results without the statistical analysis data. It needs to be revised.

3- The ethical code of the study should be written in the manuscript.

4- In Table 1, the authors should express what is the meaning of the abbreviations.

5- Many sentences of discussion did not have any references. The authors should determine the reference for the scientific content expressed in the discussion.

6- The discussion needs to be revised. In this section, the authors need to do more discussion about the obtained results.

7- It was suggested that the manuscript is published as a short communication, not the original article. The content of the manuscript was about the investigation of only one Lnc-RNA at 38 patients.

Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 May 2020

Dear author.
Please revise your manuscript according to the comments of the associate editor, In addition, Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in the authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org.
Thank you.

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:

At first, I must appreciate you for your scientific and valuable comments.

1) The grammar of the manuscript edited.
2) In the results confidence interval(CI) and Pvalue added in abstract.
3) Ethical code wrote in material methods.
4) The meaning of abbreviation expressed in below of the table.
5) References of background and discussion added and completed.
6) Discussion edited and improved.
7) Generally, gvhd sample size is so restricted, and same literature had limited sample size, there is need more time for more sampling, in addition the nobility of this manuscript is the usage of Lnc-RNAs as a new biomarker in gvhd for the first time and also serial sampling after transplantation and follow up of patients for 100 days . I would be please If I could publish this manuscript as a original letter regarding to editing and improving this manuscript.
8) The roc curve analysis added for improve results.

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) 10 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
The manuscript had many grammar mistakes yet. The manuscript needs to be edited by a person familiar with English.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Jun 2020

Dear authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. There are still some points that need consideration:
1. All abbreviations in the title of the manuscript should be defined, such as GVHD.
2. Please add the ORCID ID of the first and associate editor.
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.

To Dear Associated Editor

Regarding to your valuable revises manuscript edited and the changes mentioned below:

1) The manuscript was edited by a person familiar with English in USA

2) Abbreviations in the title of the manuscript defined

3) ORCID CODE of first author: 0000-0001-6838-2963.

Sincerely yours

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 21 Jun 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