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.84695
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(8); e84695

Peer Review Report for "Factors Affecting Recurrence and Costs of Basal Cell Carcinoma Undergoing Mohs Micrographic Surgery: A Hospital-Based Retrospective Cohort Study"

Author(s): Leila Nassiripour, Mohammadreza Amirsadri, Maryam Tabatabaeian, Mohammad Reza Maracy

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Sep 2018
Revised Date:	13 Jul 2019
Accepted Date:	16 Jul 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) — 23 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
- How confounding factors such as stage, grade… have been controlled?
- Please explain the area of subject costs and the method for measuring them?
- How did you calculate indirect costs?
- Please explain about length of follow-up for the first and second recurrence.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments, the accrual time is longer than the follow-up time in this manuscript! Report both intervals, clearly.
- The Method has not been explained well.
- Time-to-event has not been considered.
- The percentage of censored observations or recurrent events has not been - reported.

- The follow-up strategy has not been explained.
- The strategy to measure cost has not been explained.
- In Result, table 2, the number of observations in each level of predictor variables is unspecified.
- There, this manuscript needs Major Revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Mar 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's 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.

Questions	Responds	Pages/line
Reviewer1 comments:		
How confounding factors such as stage, grade… have been controlled?	Considering that the study was a retrospective cohort type, Initial data extracted from the patient hospital records. The records of the information were incomplete and unfortunately, the information of variables such as stage and grade of disease were not available. But as mentioned in the text of manuscript, the majority of the patients were in stage of Mohs surgery 1 and 2. So, we could assume that these two variables were not varied between the patients.	Page2/line56-61
Please explain area of subject costs and method for measuring them?	In the calculation of costs, direct costs are considered. Costs are extracted from the patient accounting records. As shown in Table 2, the Cost information is about the costs of before, during and after surgery, including: Visit a doctor before and after surgery, Pathology, Operating room, Gloves, Blade bistoury, Sample glass, dressing, mupirocin ointment, insulin syringe, carpool, dental needle, normal saline, nylon thread, vikril yarn, dermatome blade, shaver blade, bandage, cephalexin, Vaseline gas, Helin cream.	Page3/line77-82
How did you calculate indirect costs?	In this study, indirect costs have not been measured and direct costs have been calculated.	Page3/line77

Please explain about length of follow up for first and second recurrence	All patients were followed up for a period of 4 years after diagnosis and their information was recorded in the event of recurrence, and the next recurrences in each case from the time of initial diagnosis is considered.	Pag2/line41-44
Associate Editor's Comments:		
Based on reviewer's comments, the accrual time is longer than follow-up time in this manuscript! Report both intervals, clearly	Collection of data from 2007 to 2010, that is, patients who were admitted to study in 2007 were followed up to 2011, and patients who entered the study in 2010 were tracked by 2014. It should be noted that the relevant information was considered for each patient and the unit of measurement of relapse has been based on the day.	Page2/line38-40,52-53
The Method has not been explained well	Did you mean the method of surgery or method of collecting data or... It would be appreciated if you mention what part of methodology need to expand. Actually, in our opinion we reported all necessary details with regard of limitation in number of written words, and the relevant corrections were made and the procedure was expanded.	Page2/Line38-62,page3/77-82
Time-to-event has not been considered.	Since the results base on Cox analysis is as follows, none of variables were not statistically significant and also the 95% confidence intervals of some variables were very vide, but based on logistic regression analysis these two limitation were not occurred. We exchanged the method and results of analysis from logistic regression to cox	Page3/line87 Page3,4/line107-115 Page9, /table1 and figure 1

	regression.	
The percentage of censored observations or recurrent events has not been reported.	In the text is reported.	Page2/line61 Page3/line97
The follow-up strategy has not been explained	Considering that Mohs surgery in Isfahan province is performed only in the one clinic, Therefore, if the disease recurs, the person returns to the same clinic. Otherwise, we can assume that they were cured because the morality of disease is nearly zero. The follow up time was done by reviewing the patient hospital records, as well as telephone contacts with the patients who had not visited the clinic for re-examination.	Page2/56-61
The strategy to measure cost has not been explained.	In the text is reported.	Page3/line77-82
In Result, table 2, the number of observations in each level of predictor variables is unspecified.	Given the number entered in Table 1, it is not entered in Table 2 to avoid repetition. The necessary corrections were made in Table 2	Table2 in Pages10,11

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) 18 Jun 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Jul 2019

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of the manuscript authors in authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org.
Thank you.

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.

Questions	Responds	Pages/line
Reviewer1 comments:		
How confounding factors such as stage, grade… have been controlled?	Considering that the study was a retrospective cohort type, Initial data extracted from the patient hospital records. The records of the information were incomplete and unfortunately, the information of variables such as stage and grade of disease were not available. But as mentioned in the text of manuscript, the majority of the patients were in stage of Mohs surgery 1 and 2. So, we could assume that these two variables were not varied between the patients.	Page2/line56-61
Please explain area of subject costs and method for measuring them?	In the calculation of costs, direct costs are considered. Costs are extracted from the patient accounting records. As shown in Table 2, the Cost information is about the costs of before, during and after surgery, including: Visit a doctor before and after surgery, Pathology, Operating room, Gloves, Blade bistoury, Sample glass, dressing, mupirocin ointment, insulin syringe, carpool, dental needle, normal saline, nylon thread, vikril yarn, dermatome blade, shaver blade, bandage, cephalexin, Vaseline gas, Helin cream.	Page3/line77-82
How did you calculate indirect costs?	In this study, indirect costs have not been measured and direct costs have been calculated.	Page3/line77

Please explain about length of follow up for first and second recurrence	All patients were followed up for a period of 4 years after diagnosis and their information was recorded in the event of recurrence, and the next recurrences in each case from the time of initial diagnosis is considered.	Pag2/line41-44
Associate Editor's Comments:		
Based on reviewer's comments, the accrual time is longer than follow-up time in this manuscript! Report both intervals, clearly	Collection of data from 2007 to 2010, that is, patients who were admitted to study in 2007 were followed up to 2011, and patients who entered the study in 2010 were tracked by 2014. It should be noted that the relevant information was considered for each patient and the unit of measurement of relapse has been based on the day.	Page2/line38-40,52-53
The Method has not been explained well	Did you mean the method of surgery or method of collecting data or... It would be appreciated if you mention what part of methodology need to expand. Actually, in our opinion we reported all necessary details with regard of limitation in number of written words, and the relevant corrections were made and the procedure was expanded.	Page2/Line38-62,page3/77-82
Time-to-event has not been considered.	Since the results base on Cox analysis is as follows, none of variables were not statistically significant and also the 95% confidence intervals of some variables were very vide, but based on logistic regression analysis these two limitation were not occurred. We exchanged the method and results of analysis from logistic regression to cox	Page3/line87 Page3,4/line107-115 Page9, /table1 and figure 1

	regression.	
The percentage of censored observations or recurrent events has not been reported.	In the text is reported.	Page2/line61 Page3/line97
The follow-up strategy has not been explained	Considering that Mohs surgery in Isfahan province is performed only in the one clinic, Therefore, if the disease recurs, the person returns to the same clinic. Otherwise, we can assume that they were cured because the morality of disease is nearly zero. The follow up time was done by reviewing the patient hospital records, as well as telephone contacts with the patients who had not visited the clinic for re-examination.	Page2/56-61
The strategy to measure cost has not been explained.	In the text is reported.	Page3/line77-82
In Result, table 2, the number of observations in each level of predictor variables is unspecified.	Given the number entered in Table 1, it is not entered in Table 2 to avoid repetition. The necessary corrections were made in Table 2	Table2 in Pages10,11

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 16 Jul 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.