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.7755
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(2); e7755

Peer Review Report for "Clavicle Survival as a Free Bone Graft: A Case Report of Minor Modification Added to Pectoralis Major Flap"

Author(s): Mansoureh Mohamadi, Omid Soltaninia, Fereydoun Pourdanesh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Jul 2016
Revised Date: 14 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Sep 2020

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) — 14 Dec 2017

Dear AE,
This manuscript is helpful in refining a new technique for reconstruction surgery. According to sufficient information about this topic but it needs specific attention to the following subjects:
1. It is better to add "case report" in the title.
2. One of keywords should be "case report".
3. In the content, I didn't find prognostic characteristics of tumor such as grade of tumor.
4. There wasn't any report of radiologic and histopathology images.
5. I didn't find title of table 1.
6. This paper needs to be edited by a professional in English language.
7. Which diagnostic tests have been used for follow up the patients over 24 months?
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 15 Dec 2017

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2017

Dear Author
It is necessary to add a statement to the case presentation section, indicating that informed consent was taken from the patient. In addition, case reports cannot contain more that 2 tables or figures.
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 Reviewer

We made required changes as you demanded.

1- “Case report” was added to the title and keyword sections.
2- Statement about grading of tumor was added, but other prognostic characteristics like cervical lymph node and distant metastasis had been addressed in the paper: ... A whole work up for metastasis was clear, so he was candidate for resection…
3- In the report of radiologic and histopathology images, there were not any remarkable or unusual findings that dictate authors to refer these reports. Just conclusive data from these diagnostic modalities were written to maintain brevity of paper.
4- Title of table 1 was added to the end of article.
5- Paper was edited by a professional in English language (Radan English Edit Institute). The certificate is also available.
6- Since there were not any signs and symptoms associated with recurrence or other concomitant problems, we used panoramic image as the only diagnostic test during the follow up period.

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.

Farid Moradian: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 6 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
it's better to put a picture for identification of the vascular pedicle of this flap.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 7 Jul 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's comment.
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 Reviewer

Figure 7 was added to paper to illustrate neurovascular anatomy of PMMF. newly added sentence was highlighted.

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.

ABBAS KHODAYARI NAMIN: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 21 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for choosing me as a reviewer.
After a detailed and comprehensive evaluation of the manuscript;
I definitely agree with the publication of this case report. The case report is entirely unique and valuable, and since the article is a case report with comprehensive details it is considerable for teaching purposes.
Publication of these articles will have helpful, valuable functional and aesthetic points for all dentists, medical residents, and surgeons.
Sincerely yours

Shaghayegh Kamian: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 24 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The revised manuscript has been changed due the reviewers' comments.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 25 Aug 2020

Dear authors,
Thank you for revising your manuscript. There are still some points that need consideration:
1. In the keywords section, "pectoralis major myocutaneous flap" is not considered a MeSH heading term. "bone graft" is not a MeSH heading term, you can use "bone transplantation", instead. Please remove "case report" from the keywords list.
2. Please state in the case presentation section whether informed consent was taken from the patient.
3. There are too many figures in the manuscript. Please reduce them to 2 important figures.
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 editor-in-chief

Requested changes were made and highlighted.

Best regards

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) 20 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,

This is my pleasure to announce 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