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.113121
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(7); e113121

Peer Review Report for "Tumor Microenvironment: Involved Factors and Signaling Pathways in Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition"

Author(s): Madeh Ghaderi, Azadeh Niknejad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 26 May 2021
Accepted Date: 30 May 2021

Revision (0)

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

Mehrdad Hashemi: Reviewer | Revision (0)

28 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The authors presented a rather large review on the Tumor Microenvironment in EMT. The main drawback of the article is its lack of positioning among other review publications on the subject. It is necessary first of all to clearly indicate in the Introduction the last review works, describe their main concept, and then reconstruct the logic of the subsequent presentation so that not to repeat the facts already systematized in them (just refer to these reviews in this case), but shift the emphasis to the latest scientific data, which have not yet been systematized earlier, show the vector of modern science, etc.
In the Conclusion, emphasize the main scientific concept of the current review from the position of its scientific novelty.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0)

1 Mar 2021

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** (0)

1 Mar 2021

Dear author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the comments of the reviewer and resubmit.
thank you

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 Reviewer:

We appreciate your taking the time and your comments. It is our honor to revise the paper "Tumor Microenvironment: Involved Factors and Signaling Pathways in Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition)EMT(" based on your advice in *International Journal of Cancer Management*.

Comment1: *The main drawback of the article is its lack of positioning among other review publications on the subject. It is necessary first of all to clearly indicate in the Introduction the last review works, describe their main concept, and then reconstruct the logic of the subsequent presentation*

Recent review articles in this field are added and highlighted in the new version. Next, the goal of recent papers has been manifested and review in the introduction section to position our paper in literature.

Comment2: *emphasis to the latest scientific data, which have not yet been systematized earlier, show the vector of modern science, etc.*

The main part of the recent review is based on articles that are published during 5 years ago. Besides, we had limited based costs to add other papers. Also, in "TME cells", "TGF-β", "FGF", and "HGF' new articles were added.

Comment 3: *In the Conclusion, emphasize the main scientific concept of the current review from the position of its scientific novelty.*

We revised some parts of the conclusion based on your comment. Although, our goal, in conclusion, is to highlight the co-culturing to be the main part of literature to manifest the effect of TME cells on EMT and metastasis for clarifying in therapeutic fields.

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.

Mehrdad Hashemi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 22 Apr 2021

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 May 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 May 2021

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 (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 Associate Editor

I added the ORCID id: 0000-0001-7808-488x

Thanks

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) 24 May 2021

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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 Reviewer:

We appreciate your taking the time and your comments. It is our honor to revise the paper “Tumor Microenvironment: Involved Factors and Signaling Pathways in Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition) EMT(” based on your advice in *International Journal of Cancer Management*.

Comment1: *The main drawback of the article is its lack of positioning among other review publications on the subject. It is necessary first of all to clearly indicate in the Introduction the last review works, describe their main concept, and then reconstruct the logic of the subsequent presentation*

Recent review articles in this field are added and highlighted in the new version. Next, the goal of recent papers has been manifested and review in the introduction section to position our paper in literature.

Comment2: *emphasis to the latest scientific data, which have not yet been systematized earlier, show the vector of modern science, etc.*

The main part of the recent review is based on articles that are published during 5 years ago. Besides, we had limited based costs to add other papers. Also, in “TME cells”, “TGF-β”, “FGF”, and “HGF’ new articles were added.

Comment 3: *In the Conclusion, emphasize the main scientific concept of the current review from the position of its scientific novelty.*

We revised some parts of the conclusion based on your comment. Although, our goal, in conclusion, is to highlight the co-culturing to be the main part of literature to manifest the effect of TME cells on EMT and metastasis for clarifying in therapeutic fields.

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) 30 May 2021

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