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.90608
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(11); e90608

Peer Review Report for "The Prevalence and Association of Human Papillomavirus with Esophageal Cancer in West Azerbaijan, Iran"

Author(s): Bashir Mohammadpour, Mazaher Khodabandehloo, Morteza Motazakker

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 19 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 17 Sep 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) — 7 May 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments to the authors:
1- In the Introduction section, the authors expressed that the prevalence of HPV has been previously determined in the Iranian population (reference 11). What is the novelty of this study compared to the study performed by Jalilvand et al (2014)?
2- It needs to be expressed the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the Materials and Methods section.
3- The text of the manuscript needs to be revised. There are some grammar errors.
4- In the Materials and Methods section, the volume of the used primers should be expressed by µM, not µl.
5- In the statistical analysis section, the authors should express what the cut-off of P-value is in the present study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 7 May 2019

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

again.

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.

Reply to Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Comments to the authors:

1- In the Introduction section, the authors expressed that the prevalence of HPV has been previously determined in the Iranian population (reference 11). What is the novelty of this study compared to the study performed by Jalilvand et al (2014)?

In cancerous tissues, the genome of the papillomavirus is integrated into the host chromosome, at which time the viral genes, such as L1 are removed. In studies that their detection method is based on L1 gene, there is a potential false negative result. Therefore, our aim was evaluate the prevalence of HPV and its association with esophageal cancer using genotype specific primers (E6/E7).

2- It needs to be expressed the inclusion and exclusion criteria in the Materials and Methods section. We added it to material and method section of manuscript.

3- The text of manuscript needs to be revised. There are some grammar errors. It revised as we could.

4- In the Materials and Methods section, the volume of the used primers should be expressed by µM not µl. revised according to

5- In the statistical analysis section, the authors should express what the cut-off of P value is in the present study.

P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

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 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
1- There were grammar errors. The authors should edit the English of text.
2- The figures did not have the suitable quality. The authors should prepare the better figures.
3- The sum of the numbers does not equal 100 %. The authors should correct them.
Thanks.

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

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the comments and resubmit again.
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's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Comments to the authors:

1- There were grammar errors. The authors should edit the English of text.

We edited the grammar errors and varied words are shown in red color in the main file of manuscript (revision 2).

2- The figures did not have the suitable quality. The authors should prepare the better figures.

We changed Figure 3

3- The sum of the numbers does not equal 100 %. The authors should correct them.

We edited some of the numbers in table 2 and edited numbers are shown in red color.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 11 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
- The manuscript needs to be edited by a person familiar with professional English.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 17 Sep 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.