International Journal of Cancer Management
Volume 16 · Issue 1 · e140329

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Trend of the Incidence Rate of Kidney and Ureter Cancer in Iran from 2004 to 2016

Saeed Erfanpoor, Paria Dehesh, Jalil Hasani, Fereshteh Davoodi, Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari, Mohammad Hadizadeh, Koorosh Etemad

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Aug 2023	23 Oct 2023	18 Nov 2023	10.5812/ijcm-140329

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 2
2 Revision 1 Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Point to point response to reviewers' comments

We are grateful to the reviewers and editorial team for their insightful comments on our paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript. Here is a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewer 1:
Although the content is very interesting, the author needs to correct the following comments:

1) In general, the manuscript should be revised by a native speaker, as the language requires attention. Some sentences are hardly understandable.

Language editing for the manuscript has been done.

2) This manuscript does not have an abstract associated with it. Does not provide an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found.

The methods and results of the abstract were revised and, the conclusion of the abstract was expanded. Please see the revised manuscript, abstract, Methods (page 1, lines 12-14), Results (page 1, lines 16-21), and Conclusion (page 1, lines 22-25).

3) The Keywords should be checked in Mesh database.

Done

4) The keywords should be sorted alphabetically.

Done

5) The INTRODUCTION section does not cover sufficient literature review. Add rationale according to which you conducted this study.

The introduction were* revised *and the rational was added. Please see the revised manuscript, background, paragraph 1 (page 2, lines 7-8), paragraph 2 (page 3, lines 1-6), paragraph 3 (page 3, lines 7-15).

6) The discussion is very long and unrelated, please summarize the key results with reference to study objectives. Highlight important findings sufficiently. Please summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence and compare to other studies.

The entire discussion were re-written and recommendations added. Please see the revised manuscript, discussion (page 8, line 2-22 and page 9, lines 1-11).

7) Conclusion is not an objective measure of the title.

The Conclusion were re-written and recommendations added. Please see the revised manuscript, discussion (page 9, line 13-17).

8) The authors should see guideline for authors regarding in-text citations and reference list and make corrections. References should be relevant, recent and readily retrievable. Ref. 12 and 18 are the same!!!

DONE

9) The following papers may be helpful for the revision of the manuscript.
https://brieflands.com/articles/ijcm-10649.html
https://brieflands.com/articles/ijcm-103700.html

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 17 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 17 Nov 2023

Thank you for your thoughtful and careful responses to the critiques and comments offered with your initial submission. The author has made the necessary corrections within the article. It is acceptable.