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.103111
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(9); e103111

Peer Review Report for "Intrinsic Oncolytic Activity of Hoshino Mumps Virus Vaccine Strain Against Human Fibrosarcoma and Cervical Cancer Cell Lines"

Author(s): Behnam Alirezaie, Ashraf Mohammadi, Arash Ghalyanchi Langeroudi, Roozbeh Fallahi, Ali Reza Khosravi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	18 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	21 Aug 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) — 5 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
1- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with English.
2- The discussion has been written very weakly. Other studies were performed about the effect of oncolytic viruses on tumor therapy. The obtained results by the authors should be compared with the results of other studies and discussed about them.
3- Some sentences of the discussion did not have any references. The reference to these sentences should be added to the text.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 6 Jun 2020

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

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 Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

I response to your letter dated 06 Jun 2020; I would like to submit the revised version of our manuscript (No. 103111) entitled " Intrinsic oncolytic activity of Hoshino mumps virus vaccine strain against human fibrosarcoma and cervical cancer cell lines"
We would like to thank you and reviewers for the comments, and have revised the manuscript accordingly; I considered all comments of the reviewer point to point. However, if you any alterations are required please do let us know at your earliest convenience.

1. The MS rewrote with the help of a scientific English editing service (Author's services of KOWSAR Press).
2. It was revised as your comment (highlighted all newly added sentences in discussion).
3. Some references added to discussion

Yours sincerely,

Dr Ashraf Mohammadi
Human Viral Vaccines Department, Razi Vaccine and Serum Research Institute
a.mohammadi@rvsri.ac.ir

Prof. Ali Reza Khosravi
Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
khosravi@ut.ac.ir

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) 4 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
The English of the manuscript needs to be revised.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Aug 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, such as MOI in the abstract, FBS, MOI, DMSO, ELISA, FITC, CCID50 in the manuscript body.
2. As "MRC-5" is a normal human fetal lung fibroblast cell line, in the result section of the abstract, please use "than normal human diploid cells" instead of "than human diploid cells". In addition, change "human diploid (MRC-5)" to "normal human diploid (MRC-5)" in the methods section of the manuscript body.
3. "Vaccine" and "Virotherapy" are not MeSH heading terms. "Xenograft" is a MeSH entry term, the relevant MeSH heading term is "Heterografts".
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 Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Wish you to be in safe from COVID-19 and have good health.
I response to your letter dated 05 August 2020; I would like to submit the revised version (Version 2) of our manuscript (No. 103111) entitled " Intrinsic oncolytic activity of Hoshino mumps virus vaccine strain against human fibrosarcoma and cervical cancer cell lines"
We would like to thank you and reviewers for the comments, and have revised the manuscript accordingly; I considered all comments of the reviewer point to point. However, if you any alterations are required please do let us know at your earliest convenience.

1. The MS rewrote again with the help of a scientific English editing service (certificate attached to this mail).
2. All abbreviations defined when they are used for the first time (highlighted all newly added definitions).
3. It was revised as your comment and human diploid cell replaced with normal human diploid cell in the result section of abstract and method section (highlighted all newly added sentences).
4. Vaccine, Virotherapy and Xenograft replaced with Mesh heading terms.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Ashraf Mohammadi
Human Viral Vaccines Department, Razi Vaccine and Serum Research Institute
a.mohammadi@rvsri.ac.ir

Prof. Ali Reza Khosravi

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran

khosravi@ut.ac.ir

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 Aug 2020

Dear authors,

Thank you for revising your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

Regards