International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 15 · Issue 11 · e105009

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Co-expression of Matrix Metalloproteinase 9 (MMP9) and Motility-related Protein-1 (MRP-1/CD9) in Human Breast Cancer

Shabnam Khalilnezhad, Reza Safaralizadeh, Mohammad Ali Hosseinpour Feizi, Ahad Khalilnezhad, Davar Amani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 May 2020	15 Oct 2022	18 Oct 2022	10.5812/ijcm-105009

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 3 Aug 2020 – 4 Aug 2020

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 3 Aug 2020

Comments to the author
1- The English of the manuscript needs to be revised.
2- The number of samples was low. The authors should increase the number of samples.
3- The inclusion and exclusion of patients in the present study should be explained in the Materials and Methods section.
4- The samples included only one patient with grade III and one patient with grade I. The other cases were grade II. Therefore, the authors cannot conclude that the expression of MMP9 and CD9 was higher in the patients with grade II than in patients with grades I and III. This subject should be corrected in the Results section.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 4 Aug 2020

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

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for sending our manuscript out for review and allowing us to submit a revised version. We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions to improve our manuscript further. A point-by-point response is given below, and the manuscript is revised according to the recommendations of the reviewer and the editor.

We hope that the revised manuscript will be acceptable for publication in the International Journal of Cancer Management.

On behalf of all authors,

Yours sincerely,

Comments to the author and responses

1- **The English of the manuscript needs to be revised.**
   Answer: The entire text of the article was reviewed by an expert in English.

2- **The number of samples were low. The authors should increase the number of samples.**
   Answer: Thank you for your useful comment. I must say that the present study is a primary study and the cell studies and a large number of samples will be conducted on this gene.

3- **The inclusion and exclusion of patients in the present study should be explained in the Materials and Methods section.**
   Answer: The presence of neoplastic cells is the main diagnostic point by pathologists; however, the percentage of hormone receptors was also evaluated by pathologists. The statement was added to method section

4- **The samples included only one patient with grade III and one patient with grade I. The other cases were grade II. Therefore, the authors cannot conclude that the expression of MMP9 and CD9 were higher in the patients with grade II than patients with grade I and III. This subject should be corrected in the Results section.**
   Answer: Thanks for your very helpful comment. Because the desired analysis could not be statistically correct, it was removed and we hope to reanalyze that in large number of samples.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.