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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.108198
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(4); e108198

Peer Review Report for "Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Molecular Screening to Identify Lynch Syndrome in the Patients with Colorectal Cancer"

Author(s): Hananeh Azardoost, Farimah Rahimi, Mehrdad Zeinalian, Reza Rezayatmand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 20 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 5 Apr 2021

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) 28 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Mention colorectal cancer in the keywords.
2. Lines 32-39 must be summarized. Addressing the epidemiology of colorectal cancer is not necessary at this level.
3. Lines 67 to 39 to be summarized.
4. In line 110, you have mentioned the study time horizon. In line 118, you have considered the time horizon again as a lifetime so, Line 110 should be deleted, and mentioning the time horizon in Line 118 is sufficient.
5. 116: Be sure to mention by what criteria you converted to 2018 dollars.
6. The strengths and limitations of the study mentioned in a separate section.
7. Delete line 244 in Conclusion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This manuscript needs Major Revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Oct 2020

Dear authors,

Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer'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 Dr. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of our manuscript titled "Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Molecular Screening to Identify Lynch Syndrome in the Patients with Colorectal Cancer" to "International Journal of Cancer Management". We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript and replied to comment as below:

Q1. Mention colorectal cancer in the keywords

A1: "Colorectal Cancer" added instead of CRC in keywords.

Q2. Lines 32-39 must be summarized. Addressing the epidemiology of colorectal cancer is not necessary at this level.

A2: 3 lines of this section were deleted.

Q3. Lines 67 to 39 to be summarized

A3: Lines 67 to 39, not be found for this purpose.

Q4. In line 110, you have mentioned the study time horizon. In line 118, you have considered the time horizon again as life time so, Line 110 should be deleted and mentioning time horizon in Line 118 is sufficient

A4: Line 110 was deleted.

Q5. 116: Be sure to mention by what criteria you converted to 2018 dollars

A5: The exchange rate was extracted from the published data by the central bank of Iran that available: https://www.cbi.ir/exratesadv/exratesadv_fa.aspx

Q6. The strengths and limitations of the study mentioned in the separate section

A6: It's done.

Q7. Delete line 244 in Conclusion

A7: This line was deleted.

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: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 21 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
This study is the first one evaluating the cost-effectiveness of different strategies in patients with colorectal cancer for the detection of Lynch syndrome in Iran. This is the first national study on this topic so this topic is interesting. However, the manuscript has some drawbacks and it is not acceptable in its current form. There are some points that I mentioned them for author(s).
Introduction
1. Add the definition of Lynch syndrome to the Introduction section.
Method
2. In the method section states that the literature used to calculate the costs, please refer to them.
3. Do not use “LYG” for the first time in the method, please spell it.
4. Please add the period of the data collection and location of the study to the method.
5. Eligibility criteria and methods of selection of participants will be added to the material and method.
6. Explain how the study size was arrived at.
7. The probabilities used in this study for doing decision tree analysis by strategies should be added to figure 1.
8. In the method section, the author must say how calculated the QALY and life’s year gain (LYG).
Results & discussion
9. What is the meaning of FDR in the results section? For first time please spell it.
10. Why is the first table in the results number 3?!!!!! Correct it. This comment applies to other tables as well.
11. The author(s) should discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results.
12. You who did not compare with the lack of screening, why did you mention it in the results?
13. Author(s) should discuss about both direction and magnitude of any potential bias in the discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 2 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,

Based on reviewer' comments this manuscript needs Minor Revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 4 Jan 2021

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. In addition, please add the ORCID of the first author.
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.

Thank you for allowing us to submit a revised manuscript titled "Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Molecular Screening to Identify Lynch Syndrome in the Patients with Colorectal Cancer" to the "International Journal of Cancer Management" again. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewer have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript and replied to comment as below:

Q1. Add the definition of Lynch syndrome to the Introduction section.

A1: in the revised manuscript, the difintion of Lynch syndrome has been added to the intrudtion. Please see the first paragraph of the introduction section.

Q2. In the method section states that the literatures used to calculate the costs, please refer to them.

A2: Reference number 13 added in this section.

Q3. Do not use "LYG" for the first time in the method, please spell it.

A3: The correction has been made. (life-years gained (LYG))

Q4. Please add the period of the data collection and location of the study to the method.

A4: This study has been done in 2018 and because of the nature of economic evaluation, this would not be limited to the specific location. However, data has been collected in Isfahan, Iran.

Q5. Eligibility criteria and methods of selection of participants will be added to material and method.

A5: This is a model with 10000 hypothetical patients with early-identified CRC. There is no selection. This has been pointed out in the method section. Please see the first paragraph of the method section.

Q6. Explain how the study size was arrived at.

A6: In the economic evaluation, the study size has been hypothetically considered 1000 or 10000 cases.

Q7. The probabilities used in this study for doing decision tree analysis by strategies should be added to figure 1.

A7: Based on this comment, the figure 1 has been revised.

Q8. In the method section, the author must say how calculated the QALY and life's year gain (LYG).

A8: This has been added to the method section of the revised manuscript. Please see……

Q9. What is the meaning of FDR in the results section? For first time please spell it.

A9: The correction has been made. (first degree relatives (FDR))

Q10. Why is the first table in the results number 3?!!!!! Correct it. This comment applies to other tables as well.

A10: The number of tables have been corrected.

Q11. The author(s) should discuss the generalizability (external validity) of the study results.

A11: This discussion has been added to the revised manuscript. Please see the fourth paragraph of the discussion section.

Q12. You who did not compare with the lack of screening, why did you mention it in the results?

A12: ICERs presented in table 1, are obtained from different stategy comparing no screening.

Q13. Author(s) should discuss about both direction and magnitude of any potential bias in the discussion section.

A13: As mentioned in the method section, this study is a model-based economic evaluation using decision tree and morkov modeling. An assumptive cohort of 10 000 CRC cases has been entered in the model. Transition probabilities have been extracted from previous studies. In addition, sensitivity analysis has been conducted in order to show how changing assumptions could change the results. This has been mentioned in the revised manuscript. Please see the last paragraph of the discussion section.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 14 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
About the article entitled “Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Molecular Screening to Identify Lynch Syndrome in the Patients with Colorectal Cancer” the author(s) has corrected all the comments of the first stage, so the article is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 3 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is acceptable in this journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 5 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
This is my pleasure to announce to 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.