International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 16 · Issue 1 · e136321

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Potential miR-302, miR-132, miR-205, and miR-126 as Biomarkers for Laryngeal Squamous Cell Carcinoma

Amir Oliyaierezaie, Habib Zarredar, Milad Asadi, Venus Zafari, Dariush Shanebandi, Zahra Soleimani, Mohammad-Reza Firoozi, Shahram Ghasembaglou

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
26 Mar 2023	14 Nov 2023	18 Nov 2023	10.5812/ijcm-136321

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

1 comment · 30 Jun 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 Jun 2023

Comments to the authors:
1- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with the English language. There are many mistakes.
2- In the introduction, the authors should explain why they selected these miRNAs.
3- Why did the authors not use the Pfaffl method to analyze the data? It is more accurate than delta delta Ct.
4- The authors should state which instrument was used to perform real-time PCR.
5- In Figure 1, the title should be added to the X-axis.
5- The title of Table 3 should be corrected.
6- The correlation of demographical data with the expression of the studied miRNAs must be determined, and the results must be added to the manuscript.
7- The title of Table 1 should be corrected. It contains the demographical data as well as clinicopathological data.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

1) The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with the English language. There are many mistakes.

Response: we have revised the manuscript by person familiar with the English language.

2) 2- In the introduction, the authors should explain why they selected these miRNAs.

Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. We have added the requested part to the end of introduction.

3) Why the authors did not use the pfaffl method to analyze data? It is the more accurate than delta delta Ct.

Response: As explained in Material and methods part, we used stem loop technique to identify the expression of our targets micro-RNAs and because we have limitation in designing of primer for micro-RNAs and specificity and functionality of primers which designed by this method are accepted both method of analyzes give accurate and same data in micro-RNA studies.

4) The authors should express that which instrument was used to perform Real time PCR.

Response: Thank you so much for your valuable comment. The instrument added to material method part of study.

5) In Figure 1, the title should be added to the X axis.

Response: we have added the title of the figure to the X axis as reviewer wanted.

6) The title of Table 3 should be corrected.

Response: thank you so much for your valuable comment. We have corrected the title of Table 3.

7) The correlation of demographical data with the expression of the studied miRNAs must be determined and its results were added to the manuscript.

Response: thank you so much for your valuable comment. We have added the results to Table 3.

8) The title of Table 1 should be corrected. It contains the demographical data as well as clinicopathological data.

Response: we have corrected the title of the table 1 as a reviewer wanted.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 5 Nov 2023

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 5 Nov 2023

Comments
1- In Figure 1, the title should be added to the X axis. The authors incorrectly added the title to the Y axis. The titles of the X and Y axes should be corrected in Figure 1 again.
2- The title of Table 3 should be corrected. By the way, the data in Table 3 are unclear. This table should be revised and the information should be expressed in an understandable way.
3- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with the English language. There are still many mistakes.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewers' Comments:

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Comments

1- In Figure 1, the title should be added to the X axis. The authors incorrectly added the title to the Y axis. The title of X and Y axes should be corrected in the Figure 1 again.

Response: Thank you so much for your Attention. We have corrected the figure 1 as a reviewer wanted.

2- The title of Table 3 should be corrected. By the way, data of Table 3 is unclear. This table should be revised and the information should be expressed in an understandable way.

Response: we have corrected the title of the table 3. We also revised the all of the table 3 as a reviewer wanted.

3- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with the English language. There are many mistakes yet.

Response: We have revised the manuscript with a native English person as a respectable reviewer wanted.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 16 Nov 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 16 Nov 2023

The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with the English language.