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.107956
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(2); e107956

Peer Review Report for "Bacteria in Carcinogenesis and Cancer Prevention: A Review Study"

Author(s): Negin Nokhandani, Arash Poursheikhani, Mahdieh Naghavi Alhosseini, Homa Davoodi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 16 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Nov 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) 11 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should prepare the manuscript according to the IJCM's author guidelines, which can be found on the journal's website. The abstract and manuscript body of a review article should contain a conclusion section. In addition please prepare the manuscript body, similar to the abstract. Most of the content of the manuscript body should be in the result section, which is the result of the search strategy, not in the context section. The authors can see similar published review articles in IJCM.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 11 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

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

1- The manuscript was edited according to IJCM's author guidelines.

2- conclusion section was added.

3- The results section was completed.

4- manuscript body and the abstract was edited to be relatively similar.

Sincerely yours.

Dr. Davoodi

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.

Ailar Jamalli: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well written, the authors can find the proposed corrections as:
1- It is better to explain more about the different mechanisms by that a bacterial toxin can cause cancer or prevent cancer. One or two examples of bacterial toxins and types of cancer are needed.
2- In the part of bacterial metabolites, it is better to give at least one example for each metabolite, which cancers have been related to the presence of these metabolites?
3- In the Gene therapy and vectors section, it is better to give at least one or two examples of the use of gene therapy in the treatment of cancer.
4- The proportion of content in different parts of the manuscript has not been considered. The discussion on parts is many and some are few.
5-Give a brief definition of NKT cells.
6- It is recommended to add the discussion part to the manuscript.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Sep 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 minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Sep 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.
Regards

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 Editorial Board of ***International Journal of Cancer Management***

Thank you for sending the reviewer's comments and inviting revision and resubmission of our manuscript entitled " **A glimpse of Bacteria in Carcinogenesis and cancer prevention**". The manuscript was revised in accordance with the suggestions of the reviewers and all the questions were addressed. All the demand changes were highlighted with the yellow color in the main manuscript. We hope the manuscript is now acceptable.

Yours Sincerely,

Homa Davoodi,

Cancer Research Center, University of Golestan Medical Sciences, Gorgan, Iran.

E-mail: homdavoodi@yahoo.com

Tel: 0989112691994

Referee 1

The manuscript is well written, please find the proposed corrections as:

Comment #1: 1- It is better to explain more about the different mechanisms that a bacterial toxin can cause cancer or prevent cancer. One or two examples of bacterial toxins and types of cancer is needed.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the careful and thorough reading of this manuscript. The mentioned statements have been updated.

Comment #2: In the part of bacterial metabolites, it is better to give at least one example for each metabolite, which cancers have been related to the presence of these metabolites?

Response: Thank you for this comment. The mentioned statements have been added.

Comment #3: In the Gene therapy and vectors section, it is better to give at least one or two examples of the use of gene therapy in the treatment of cancer.

Response: Thank you for your good insight. The suggested comment has now been applied.

Comment #4: Proportion of content in different parts of manuscript has not been considered. The discussion on parts are many and some are few.

Response: Thank you for scrutinizing the manuscript. The mentioned statements have been updated.

Comment #5: Give a brief definition of NKT cells.

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion. The sentence is now added.

Comment #6: It is recommended to add the discussion part in the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your helpful suggestion. We have now added the suggested comment.

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) 14 Nov 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) 14 Nov 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 Editorial Board of ***International Journal of Cancer Management***

Thank you for sending the reviewer's comments and inviting revision and resubmission of our manuscript entitled " **A glimpse of Bacteria in Carcinogenesis and cancer prevention**". The manuscript was revised in accordance with the suggestions of the reviewers and all the questions were addressed. All the demand changes were highlighted with the yellow color in the main manuscript. We hope the manuscript is now acceptable.

Yours Sincerely,

Homa Davoodi,

Cancer Research Center, University of Golestan Medical Sciences, Gorgan, Iran.

E-mail: homdavoodi@yahoo.com

Tel: 0989112691994

Thank you for your helpful suggestion.

1- Please add a result section to the abstract.

   Result have been yellow colored in the abstract.

2- Please remove "prevention" from keywords list, as it is not considered a MeSH term.

   "Prevention" was removed.

3- Please define all abbreviations used in each table, below that table.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 23 Nov 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 23 Nov 2020

Dear authors,
Thank you for revising your manuscript.
Thanks