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.107505
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(1); e107505

Peer Review Report for "Ileocolic Interposition as a Gastric Substitute in Patients with Total Gastrectomy; Case Series and Literature Review"

Author(s): Ehsan Soltani, Habibollah Mahmoudzadeh, Ramesh Omranipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 16 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 20 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)

30 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Manuscript ID:
Title
1) Is the article TITLE appropriate?
Yes *□ No □
2) Does the TITLE reflect the content properly?
Yes *□ No □
3) Are there any abbreviations in the TITLE, without definition?
Yes □ No *□
Abstract
4) Is the ABSTRACT structured?
Yes *□ No □
5) Is the ABSTRACT accurate and adequate? (Does the ABSTRACT describe the content accurately?)
Yes *□ No □
Introduction

6) Are the objectives/hypotheses of the study clear? (Are the objectives clearly stated?)

Yes *□ No □

7) Does INTRODUCTION include: “What we know”, “What we don’t know” and “Aims” of current study?

Yes *□ No □

Materials and Methods

8) Do the authors clearly describe the selection of participants (patients, laboratory animals, or cell lines, including controls)?

Yes *□ No □

9) Is the study design described sufficiently?

Yes *□ No □

10) Are the studied sample adequate? This article is the case report

Yes □ No □

11) Are the actual P values for primary analyses reported? This article is a case report

12)

Yes □ No □ Does not apply □

13) Are the methods, and apparatus (the manufacturer’s name and address in parentheses) identifiable?

Yes* □ No □ Does not apply □

14) Are the procedures identifiable in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

15) Are the references to established methods and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known, given?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

16) Do the authors describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations?

Yes* □ No □ Does not apply □

17) Are all used drugs and chemicals precisely identifiable, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration?

Yes □ No □ Does not apply *□

18) Are inclusion/exclusion criteria explained?

Yes* □ No □ Does not apply □

19) Is appropriate statistical analysis used?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

20) Are all statistical methods identifiable unambiguously?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

21) Are ethical considerations explained?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

Review Articles

22) Do the authors include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data? it's not a review article.

Yes □ No □

Case Report

23) Do the authors use proper writing of principles and elements of medical history?

Yes* □ No □

24) Is paraclinical examination indicated?

Yes* □ No □

25) Is medical ethics for case presentation considered? (Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of human subjects?)

Yes □ No* □

Results

26) Is the interpretation of RESULTS accurate?

Yes* □ No □

27) Are the RESULTS recorded appropriately?

Yes *□ No □

28) Are the TABLES and FIGURES appropriate, clear, and adequate?

Yes *□ No □ Does not apply □

29) Are the results ¬presented in logical sequence in the text, tables, and figures?

Yes *□ No □

30) Are there repeat data in the TABLES and TEXT?

31) *Yes □ No □

32) Are the tables and figures needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support?

Yes *□ No □

33) Are there duplicate data in FIGURES and TABLES

Yes □ No *□

Discussion

34) Is the DISCUSSION section relevant?

Yes *□ No □

35) Are the CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated?

Yes *□ No □

36) Does the analysis support CONCLUSIONS?

Yes *□ No □

37) Are the CONCLUSIONS supported by the discussion?

Yes *□ No □

References

38) Are the REFERENCES appropriate?

Yes* □ No □

39) Are the REFERENCES written properly?

Yes *□ No □

40) Are references for the last 5 years included?

Yes *□ No □

General Review

41) Is proper style for medical writing used?

Yes *□ No □

42) Are unique terms and abbreviations defined, when they are used for the first time?

Yes *□ No □

43) Is proper English grammar and writing used?

Yes* □ No □

44) Are there any sections too long?

Yes □ No *□ Which one?

45) Are there any sections too short?
Yes □ No *□ Which one?
46) Do you have any more comments? Due to new method of surgery taking into consideration of ethical aspects is crucial .
47) Your Final Conclusion is:
Accept *□,
Minor Revision *□,
Major Revision □,
Reject □
48) Is the subject of the manuscript important and original? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?)
Yes *□ No □
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Aug 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** (0) 1 Aug 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 Editor in Chief,

I received your comments on our revised manuscript 107505 (revision), entitled "Ileocolic interposition as a gastric substitute in patients with total gastrectomy – case series and literature review".
I would like to thank you for consideration our work and for your thoughtful comments.
While we would be willing to respond to the questions, and revise the manuscript according to these suggestions, we would be pleased if the work to be re-evaluated for possible publication in the Journal.
You may find our detailed response to the issues raised in the comments below:

Reviewers' response:

Reviewer #1:

Due to new method of surgery taking into consideration of ethical aspects is crucial.

- **DONE**

Associate Editor #1:

Define all abbreviations when they are used for the first time

- **DONE**

In the discussion, the authors should compare the results of this study with the results of other published studies

- **In fact, the main purpose of this study is to introduce a new surgical technique and to investigate the feasibility of that. Therefore, to evaluate the functional results of this technique, it is necessary to conduct studies with more patients and longer follow-up. This was explained in the article.**

Please state in the methods section that the relevant ethics committee approved the study

- **DONE**

Finally, if you have any further comments or issues that you would like us to consider, please let us know.

Thank you in anticipation.

I'm looking forward to your early decision.

Best regards,

Ehsan Soltani**, M.D.**
Corresponding author
August 9, 2020

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 12 Sep 2020

Dear authors,

Thank you for revising your manuscript. There are still some points that need consideration:

1. In the material and methods section, first paragraph, you mention: "Patient's characteristics are showed in Table 1 . " Please move this sentence to the results section.

2. Please show the data presented in table 4 as a graph, not a table.

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 in Chief,

I received your comments on our revised manuscript 107505 (revision), entitled "Ileocolic interposition as a gastric substitute in patients with total gastrectomy – case series and literature review".
I would like to thank you for consideration our work and for your thoughtful comments.
While we would be willing to respond to the questions, and revise the manuscript according to these suggestions, we would be pleased if the work to be re-evaluated for possible publication in the Journal.
You may find our detailed response to the issues raised in the comments below:

Reviewers' response:

1. **In the material and methods section, first paragraph, you mention: "Patient's characteristics are showed in Table 1 . " Please move this sentence to the results section.**

- **DONE**

2. **Please show the data presented in table 4 as a graph, not a table.**

- **DONE**

Finally, if you have any further comments or issues that you would like us to consider, please let us know.

Thank you in anticipation.

I'm looking forward to your early decision.

Best regards,

Ehsan Soltani**, M.D.**
Corresponding author
September 29, 2020

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 3 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The auhttors should add the abstract and keywords to the main manuscript word file. In the keywords section, "Gastric Cancer" is not a MeSH heading term, the correct term is "Stomach Neoplasms". "Gastric substitute" is not a MeSH term. Please provide at least 3 keywords selected from "MeSH heading terms". Also, in the methods section, please mention which ethics committee approved the study.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 3 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 in Chief,

I received your comments on our revised manuscript 107505 (revision), entitled "Ileocolic interposition as a gastric substitute in patients with total gastrectomy – case series and literature review".
I would like to thank you for consideration our work and for your thoughtful comments.
While we would be willing to respond to the questions, and revise the manuscript according to these suggestions, we would be pleased if the work to be re-evaluated for possible publication in the Journal.
You may find our detailed response to the issues raised in the comments below:

Reviewers' response:

1. **Please add the abstract and keywords to the main manuscript word file.**

- **DONE**

2. **Please provide at least 3 keywords selected from "MeSH heading terms".**

- **DONE**

3. **In the methods section, please mention which ethics committee approved the study.**

- **DONE**

Finally, if you have any further comments or issues that you would like us to consider, please let us know.

Thank you in anticipation.

I'm looking forward to your early decision.

Best regards,

Ehsan Soltani**, M.D.**
Corresponding author
October 11, 2020

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) 13 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in 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 (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 in Chief,

I received your comments on our revised manuscript 107505 (revision), entitled "Ileocolic interposition as a gastric substitute in patients with total gastrectomy – case series and literature review".
I would like to thank you for consideration our work and for your thoughtful comments.
While we would be willing to respond to the questions, and revise the manuscript according to these suggestions, we would be pleased if the work to be re-evaluated for possible publication in the Journal.
You may find our detailed response to the issues raised in the comments below:

Reviewers' response:

1. **Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in authors section when submitting the revised manuscript**

- **DONE**

Finally, if you have any further comments or issues that you would like us to consider, please let us know.

Thank you in anticipation.

I'm looking forward to your early decision.

Best regards,

Ehsan Soltani**, M.D.**
Corresponding author
October 15, 2020

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)** 20 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