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.89629
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(5); e89629

Peer Review Report for "Brain Metastases in a 12-Year-Old Girl with Osteosarcoma: A Case Report"

Author(s): Hossein Karami, Mohammad Naderisorki

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jan 2019
Revised Date: 7 Apr 2019
Accepted Date: 22 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Comments to the author:
1- A case report should comprise no more than 2 tables or figures.
2- DOI & PMID must be added.
3- Appropriateness of reference writing was not observed.
4- You should write the number of references in parenthesis before full stops, not after them.
5- It is better to include conclusion as the last paragraph of discussion, not apart pf that.
6- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation without full description for the first time both in abstract and the text: OS- CT scan.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 15 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the author:
1- A case report should comprise no more than 2 tables or figures.
2- DOI & PMID must be added.
3- Appropriateness of reference writing was not observed.

4- You should write the number of references in parenthesis before full stops, not after them.

5- It is better to include conclusion as the last paragraph of discussion, not apart pf that.

6- We are not allowed to use any abbreviation without full description for the first time both in abstract and the text: OS- CT scan.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

16 Feb 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the associate editor's and reviewer'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

All the defects of the article were corrected by orders.

1-Figures in case report was decreased.

2-DOI & PMID were added.

3-Appropriatness of reference writing was corrected.

4-The number of references was written in parenthesis before full stops.

5-Abbreviation was corrected.

6- and Ethical and Legal Considerations was considered at the end of the manuscript.

Best 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Apr 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Apr 2019

Dear Author:
This manuscript describes a study on " Brain Metastases in A 12-Year-Old Girl with Osteosarcoma: A Case Report". You have revised your manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.