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://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.82413
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(9); e82413

Peer Review Report for "Endocan Expression Profile in Different Grades of Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma"

Author(s): Soussan Irani, Negin Amiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jul 2018
Revised Date: 17 Jul 2019
Accepted Date: 10 Aug 2019

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) — 18 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
good idea, the new trial for treatment of scc.
Thanks,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
Although the manuscripts topic seems interesting but is not written strongly especially in case of proper English writing. The results does not meet criteria for novelty and are predictable as in other tumors. I hope the information's provided by other reviewers will be helpful in future studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 30 Aug 2018

Dear EIC,
There are some comments to the author:
- Important, timely, relevant, critical, prevalent problem.

- The manuscript is written in poor English, Needs to carefully revised by a native English speaker or a professional language editing service to improve the grammar and readability, I have marked some errors.
- Well-designed study (appropriate, rigorous, comprehensive design).
- Thoughtful, focused, up-to-date review of the literature.
- Sample size sufficiently large.
- Practical, useful implications.
- Interpretation took into account the limitations of the study.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 Sep 2018

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' and associate editor's comments.

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 Reviewers,

Many thanks for your careful revision. The result section was revised. Figures 4-6 were added to the main text.

Warm Regards

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) 23 Nov 2018

Dear EIC,
There are several typos, especially in description of the images that need correction. Also the color of the arrow is mentioned green but the color is yellow. Needs to carefully revised.
Otherwise; important, timely, relevant, critical, prevalent problem
- Well-written manuscript.
- Well-designed study.
- Up-to-date review of the literature.
- Sample size sufficiently large.
- Practical, useful implications.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Nov 2018

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's comments.
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.

:Associate Editor 1

Manuscript ID: 82413| Int J Cancer Manag, rev [1]| Manuscript Needs Minor Revision

,Dear Authors
There are several typos, especially in description of the images that need correction. Also the color of the arrow is mentioned green but the color is yellow. Needs to carefully revised: I .did my best. The color of arrow was corrected
Otherwise; important, timely, relevant, critical, prevalent problem
Well-written manuscript
Well-designed study
Up-to-date review of the literature
Sample size sufficiently large
Practical, useful implications
.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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 28 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
I found the paper to be re-written better overally and the data are confimatory of well-known outcomes. The main concern I have about this study is with results that lack sufficient data. I expect you to describe the details of your cases and mention how many out of a total of 54 cases were put in the well-differentiated, moderately-differentiated, and poorly-differentiated groups and how strong endocan expression was in each group. After all, is statistical analysis reliable with limited samples in these groups?
On the other hand, the discussion is not coherent enough and the text is not presented in the right sections.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
Good work, accurate methodology with a few drawbacks, for example no details were provided as to the measurement of microvessel density. Was it done with the help of a digital camera and software or otherwise? How was the cut-off 15 obtained? The English grammar and writing need minor revisions too. For example in line 3 of abstract the word should be "malignancies" instead of malignancy. Line 2 of abstraction (also repeated in introduction) says “mortality proportion” which is not correct, “mortality rate” would be a better term. Overall the article definitely needs English editing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 1 Jan 2019

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** (2) 2 Jan 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

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.

:Reviewer 1

Good work, accurate methodology with a few drawbacks, for example no details were provided as to the measurement of microvessel density. Was it done with the help of a digital camera and software or otherwise? How was the cut-off 15 obtained. All points were .mentioned and highlighted in the manuscript

The English grammar and writing need minor revisions too. For example in line 3 of abstract the word should be "malignancies" instead of malignancy. Line 2 of abstraction (also repeated in introduction) says “mortality proportion” which is not correct, “mortality rate” .would be a better term. Overall the article definitely needs English editing. Corrected

:Reviewer 2

The main concern I have about this study is with results that lack sufficient data. I expect you to describe the details of your cases and mention how many out of total 54 cases were put in the well-differentiated , moderately-differentiated and poorly-differentiated groups. It had .been mentioned before: A total of 54 samples (18 samples of each grade)

.how strong endocan expression was in each group? The table 1 shows all details

After all, is statistical analysis reliable with limited samples in these groups?I think so. The .sample size is large enough

On the other hand, the discussion is not coherent enough and the text is not presented in right sections. I did my best to make it more coherent. Hope this time it .is O.K. Thanks for your comments

.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 18 May 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for forwarding the manuscript entitled “Endocan expression profile in different grades of Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma”. In my view, the author has done a good scientific study. However, the manuscript still requires some corrections. I am listing below the type of errors with examples and suggestions for correction.
1- Where are the samples collected? Tehran or Hamadan?
In the abstract, the samples were collected from Tehran, but in Material & Methods, they were collected from Hamadan !!
2- Writing references needs to be edited. For example, the name of the journal has not been written in numbers 26, 30, 36, and 38.
3- The figures should be matched with text and be addressed correctly.
4- Conflict of interest, should be mentioned if it exists in this study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 25 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The author's effort to edit previous version is completely appreciated.
1) As I said before, the title is interesting.
2) English writing is considerably improved.
3) The detailed data are added in tables.
4) Discussion is nicely annotated but in paragraph 3, line 1, they pointed to correlation with pituitary adenoma histology grading while there is no defined histologic grade for pituitary adenoma in literature.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 25 Jun 2019

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

Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 2 Jul 2019

Dear Author,

Please consider the comments of the reviewer and resubmit again.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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.

:Reviewer 1
.Your effort to edit previous version is completely appreciated
.As I said before, the title is interesting (1
.English writing is considerably improved (2
.The detailed data are added in tables (3
Discussion is nicely annotated but in paragraph 3, line 1, you pointed to correlation with (4 pituitary adenoma histology grading while there is no defined histologic grade for pituitary .adenoma in literature. Many thanks for your comment, it was removed

:Reviewer 2
Dear Associate Editor 2019-05-19

Thank you for forwarding the manuscript entitled “Endocan expression profile in different grades of Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma”.In my view the author have done a good scientific study.However the manuscript still requires some corrections .I am listing below the type of .errors with examples and suggestions for correction
Where are the samples collected? Tehran or Hamadan?Hamadan -1
In abstract the samples were collected from Tehran , but in Material & Methods they were .collected from Hamadan !! Sorry, it was a mistake
Writing references needs to be edited. For example the name of journal has not been -2 .written in numbers 26, 30, 36 and 38.Many thanks , were corrected and highlighted
The figures should be matched with text and be addressed correctly. Figures 1-3 -3 demonstrate strong endocan positivity in different histological grades of tumor,at the invasive .front and detached cells as mentioned and addressed in the text

Figures 4-6 show VM formation (vascular channel lined by tumor cells) in different .histologic grades as mentioned and addressed in the text
Conflict of interest ,should be mentioned ,if it exists in this study. Was mentioned -4

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (4)** 10 Aug 2019

Dear Author,

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.