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.114180
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(6); e114180

Peer Review Report for "Metachronous Diffuse Large B-Cell Lymphoma of the Breasts: A Case Report and Review of the Literature."

Author(s): Mastane Saneii , Pedram Fadavi, Kambiz Novin, Maryam Garousi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 26 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 17 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

31 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Thank you for submitting this case report regarding the breast relapse of primary breast lymphoma. Although it is a rare condition, it has been reported in several case reports and case series in the English literature (e.g. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsurg.2008.06.012, DOI: 10.1080/1042819031000079195). In addition, this case report doesn't include the essential components of a standard case report (including the radiographic and histopathological imaging). Therefore, the manuscript is not acceptable with its current status. The followings are the summary of my review for this clinical case report:
1. The standard of writing: Average
2. Whether there is something new or important to learn from this case: No
3. Discussion of the differential diagnosis and management of the patient: Poor
4. The quality of the literature review: Good
5. The validity of the conclusions drawn: Good
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
This case report doesn't include the essential components of a standard case report (including the radiographic and histopathological imaging). Therefore, the manuscript is not acceptable with its current status. The followings are the summary of my review for this clinical case report:
1. The standard of writing: Average
2. Whether there is something new or important to learn from this case: No
3. Discussion of the differential diagnosis and management of the patient: Poor
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Apr 2021

Dear author,
Please revise the manuscript according to the comments of reviewer and associate editor 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.

REPLY TO REVIEWERS:

Dear colleague

Thank you for reviewing of our article

REVIEWR1:

Primary breast lymphoma is a rare disease so report of this rare condition with its recurrence have some points. Although there are some study on this issue but mostly are case reports and case series and mostly in other country and we report this case in iran.On the other handThere is no consensus on the definitive treatment and pattern of the relapse are different between studies . The point of this study is that, we review the pattern of recurrence or second primary lymphoma of this disease.

As you advised, we added the pathology imaging studies.

Reply to editors:

As mentioned above, we added imaging and microscopic view

Best regard

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 8 May 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the submission.
Important issue.
Well-written case report (clear, straightforward, easy to follow, logical)
A thoughtful, focused, up-to-date review of the literature
Practical, useful implications
Interpretation took into account the limitations.
Sincerely,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 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