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.87773
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(4); e87773

Peer Review Report for "Myeloid Cell Leukemia-1 (MCL-1) siRNA Therapy Showed Cytotoxic Effect on T Cells Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia"

Author(s): Shaghayegh Askarian-Amiri, Farzane Ordoni Aval, Abbas Azadmehr, Morteza Oladnabi, Mahjoobeh Jafari Vesiehsari, Mahmoud Hajiahmadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Dec 2018
Revised Date: 12 Mar 2019
Accepted Date: 10 Apr 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 1 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments:
1- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with English.
2- The explanation of methods should be deleted from the results section.
3- The horizontal axis of the figures needs a title. The authors should revise the figures.
4- The authors should explain that why they used the 2-(ΔΔCT) method for the determination of the expression level. Why did not they use the pfaffl method? The pfaffl method is more accurate than the 2-(ΔΔCT) method.
5- The conclusion section should be added to the end of the discussion section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 2 Mar 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the 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 editor of International Journal of Cancer Management

Thank you very much for your comments. This submission is the revised version of our manuscript. The responses to revisions have been brought in the corresponding file and applied in the text of the manuscript. All authors have read and confirmed the validity of the data in the revision file. We answered to your comments point by point as follow:

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Comments:

1- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with English.
Answer to comment: Thank you very much for your useful comment. We asked a native expert who is active in the field to read the manuscript and eliminate syntax and grammatical mistakes.

2- The explanation of methods should be deleted from the results section.
Answer to comment: Based on your useful comment, we eliminated the explanation of methods from results.

3- The horizontal axis of the figures needs title. The authors should revise the figures.
Answer to comment: Thank you very much for your useful comment. We added titles to the horizontal axis of figures.

4- The authors should explain that why they used the 2-(ΔΔCT) method for the determination of the expression level. Why did not they use the pfaffl method? The pfaffl method is more accurate than the $2^{-(\Delta\Delta CT)}$ method.
Answer to comment: Authors highly appreciate your attention for this manuscript. We performed analysis based on idea of operator of RT-PCR in our university who was active in the field of RT-PCR and also this method is common in our university. Yes, regarding to reviewer comment, we will use pfaffl method in the future study.

5- The conclusion section should be added to the end of the discussion section.
Answer to comment: We revised the manuscript based on your useful comment and highlighted changes. We added conclusion section to the end of the discussion section.

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) 9 Apr 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors performed the suggested comments and the revised version of the manuscript has been prepared according to the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
Your manuscript has been accepted by the editorial committee after peer review in IJCM journal. Hopefully, it will be published in future issues.
Thanks.