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.109190
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(4); e109190

Peer Review Report for "Trends of Colorectal Cancer Epidemiology and Morphology in Tehran Metropolis, Iran from 2006 to 2015"

Author(s): Mehdi Azizmohammad Looha, Gohar Mohammadi, Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari, Elham Partovipour, Majid Samsami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 24 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) 12 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Manuscript ID: ID: 109190,
Title: Trends of Colorectal Cancer Epidemiology and.
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 selection of participants (patients, laboratory animals, or cell lines, including controls)?

Yes □ ** No □

It’s clear that the study all case of colorectal cancer in specific period.

9) Is the study design described sufficiently?

Yes □ ** No □

10) Are the studied sample adequate?

Yes □ ** No □

Like the previous question the study is descriptive and included all case of CRC.

11) Are the actual P values for primary analyses reported?

Yes □ No □ Does not apply □**

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

Yes □ ** No □ Does not apply □

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

Yes □ ** No □ Does not apply □

14) 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 □

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

Yes □ No □ ** Does not apply □

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

Yes □ No □ Does not apply □**

17) Are inclusion/exclusion criteria explained?

Yes □ No □ Does not apply □**ALL the case of CRC was included.

18) Is appropriate statistical analysis used?

Yes □ ** No □ Does not apply □

19) Are all statistical methods identifiable unambiguously?

Yes □ ** No □ Does not apply □

20) Are ethical considerations explained?

Yes □ No □ Does not apply □*It’s not necessary.

Review Articles

21) Do the authors include a section describing the methods used for locating, selecting, extracting, and synthesizing data? It’s not related to this article.

Yes □ No □

Case Report

22) Do the authors use proper writing of principles and elements of medical history? It’s not related to this article.

Yes □ No □

23) Is paraclinical examination indicated? It's not related to this article.

Yes □ No □

24) Is medical ethics for case presentation considered? (Are there any special ethical concerns arising from the use of human subjects?) It's not related to this article.

Yes □ No □

Results

25) Is the interpretation of RESULTS accurate?

Yes □ ** No □

26) Are the RESULTS recorded appropriately?

Yes □ ** No □

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

Yes □ ** No □ Does not apply □

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

Yes □ ** No □

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

Yes □ No □ **

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

Yes □ No □ **

31) Are there duplicate data in FIGURES and TABLES?

Yes □ No □ **

Discussion

32) Is the DISCUSSION section relevant?

Yes □ ** No □

33) Are the CONCLUSIONS justified & substantiated?

Yes □** No □

34) Does the analysis support CONCLUSIONS?

Yes □ ** No □

35) Are the CONCLUSIONS supported by the discussion?

Yes □ ** No □

References

36) Are the REFERENCES appropriate?

Yes □ ** No □

37) Are the REFERENCES written properly?

Yes □ ** No □

38) Are references for the last 5 years included?

Yes □ ** No □

General Review

39) Is proper style for medical writing used?

Yes □ ** No □

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

Yes □ ** No □

41) Is proper English grammar and writing used?

Yes □ ** No □

42) Are there any sections too long?

Yes □ No □ ** Which one?

43) Are there any sections too short?
Yes □ No □** Which one?
44) Do you have any more comments?
This article composed of different aspects of CRC in Tehran that can be used for governmental planning and prophylaxis procedures and screening protocols.
45) Your Final Conclusion is:
Accept **□,
Minor Revision □,
Major Revision □,
Reject □
46) Is the subject of the manuscript important and original? (Is the information, or the interpretation of the information, new?)
Yes □ * No □
due to taking into consideration of different aspects of CRC this article is helpful.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
I believe this manuscript provides no important information and findings regarding CRC in Tehran and maybe a local Journal would a better option to publish it instead of an international one.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Although there is no problem in the methodology of this manuscript, it reports the old (five years ago) information from a city. It is not interesting for this journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
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.