**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.110907
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(4); e110907

# Peer Review Report for "COVID-19 in Cancer and Non-cancer Patients"

**Author(s):** Farzad Taghizadeh-Hesary, Pejman Porouhan, Davood Soroosh, Babak PeyroShabany, Soodabeh Shahidsales, Batol Keykhosravi, Faeze Rahimi, Mohammad Houshyari, Mohammad Mehdi Forouzanfar, Seyed Alireza Javadinia

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 7 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 12 Dec 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Amir Shahram Yousefi Kashi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 7 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
This article has already been submitted with ID number 109309 and reviewed with minor revision. The authors corrected all comments.
Thank you for you attention.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 9 Nov 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's comments. In addition, please remove "outcome" and "Retrospective case study" from the keywords list, as they are not MeSH terms.
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 Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Editor-in-Chief

International Journal of Cancer Management

Thank you for your consideration. We revised the article based on your recommendations and highlighted the changes in the text.

Regards,

Dr Javadinia

**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)** 6 Dec 2020

Dear authors,

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

1. It is better to revise the title of the manuscript, such as "COVID-19 in cancer patients" , or another title. The current title mostly describes the methodology of the study.

2. In the result section of the abstract, please add the unit of measurement of "fever". "fever (72 .7 ? vs 45.8 ? p=0.02"

3. In the study design section of the manuscript body please explain the sample size. In addition, please explain how the cases and controls were selected.

4. In the statistical analysis section, please perform "logistic regression analysis".

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 Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Editor-in-Chief

International Journal of Cancer Management

Thank you for your consideration. We revised the article based on your recommendations and highlighted the changes in the text. Also, we provided detailed pointed by pointed responses to each one of comments below.

Regards,

Dr Javadinia

Dear authors,

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

1. It is better to revise the title of the manuscript, such as "COVID-19 in cancer patients" , or another title. The current title mostly describes the methodology y of the study.

- Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We revised the tile based on your comment as "COVID-19 in cancer and non-cancer patients"

2. In the result section of the abstract, please add the unit of measurement of "fever". "fever (72 . 7 ? vs 45.8 ?, p=0.02"

- Response: Thank you for your detailed review and your comment. The data reported the precent of patients who had fever at the time of presentation. We changed the sentence as following to overcome the confusion: "fever (72.7% vs 45.8%, p=0.02)."

3. In the study design section of the manuscript body please explain the sample size. In addition, please explain how the cases and controls were selected.

- Thank you for your comment. In section 2.3., we added information regarding the sampling method and sample size as: All patients with cancer whom were admitted during the first wave of COVID-19 pandemic were enrolled. To compare data, patients without any history of malignancies whom were admitted during the same time were selected randomly using table of random number which were generated by https://www.random.org.

4. In the statistical analysis section, please perform "logistic regression analysis".

- Thank you for your comment. In this study we did not aim to perform the logistic regression analysis. Currently, we are following up patients with cancer whom were

admitted during the second and third waves of COVID-19 pandemic to include higher number of patients. Therefore, in the upcoming analysis, we will perform the logistic regression analysis.

**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**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 12 Dec 2020

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.