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.91020
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(8); e91020

Peer Review Report for "The Critical Assessment of the Quality of Common Clinical Guidelines for Administering Chemotherapy Drugs by Using AGREE II Tool"

Author(s): Tayebeh Karimi, Masoud Bahrami, Ghasem Yadegarfar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 12 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 29 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 14 Apr 2019

Dear EIC,
1. In the third paragraph of the page 5, please mention the reference.
2. Explain more about validity and reliability of Agree tool?
Thanks.

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

Dear AE,
Comments to the author:
1- The discussion section was not observed.
2- The conclusion part was too long.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 May 2019

Dear EIC,

1- The discussion section was not observed.

2- The conclusion part was too long.

Thanks.

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

9 May 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript based on the reviewers' comments and resubmit it again.

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.

Journal:	International Journal of Cancer Management
Manuscript ID:	91020
Title:	The Critical Assessment of the Quality of Common Clinical Guidelines for Administering Chemotherapy Drugs by Using AGREE II Tool
Revision:	[0]

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Q: *1- Discussion section was not observed.* ***R:*** *Done in page 10 at the last paragraph and page 11.*

Q: *2- Conclusion part was too long.* ***R:*** *Corrected in page 12*

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Q: *1. In the third paragraph of the page 4, please mention the reference.* ***R:*** *The wrong reference is corrected.*
Q: *2. Explain more about validity and reliability of Agree tool.* ***R:*** *Done in page 4 at the last paragraph.*

Associate Editor 2:
Q: *1- Discussion section was not observed.* ***R:*** *Done in page 10 at the last paragraph and page 11.*

Q: *2- Conclusion part was too long.* ***R:*** *Corrected in page 12*

Journal:	International Journal of Cancer Management
Manuscript ID:	91020
Title:	The Critical Assessment of the Quality of Common Clinical Guidelines for Administering Chemotherapy Drugs by Using AGREE II Tool
Revision:	[1]

-Files Checking:

[Manuscript Files: Not OK]

Your manuscript does not follow the journal's standards, please correct your files according to the journal terms.

Q: Ethical and Legal Considerations. ***R:*** *Done in page 12 at the fourth paragraph.*

Q: Funding/Support. ***R:*** *removed and Acknowledgments replaced, in page 12 at the third paragraph.*

Style Checking:

[Article Standard: Not OK]

Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions.

- Article Type

Q: It seems that you have selected a wrong article type for your manuscript: ***R:*** *Article Type change to Review Article and edit the manuscript in All pages*

Journal:	International Journal of Cancer Management
Manuscript ID:	91020
Title:	The Critical Assessment of the Quality of Common Clinical Guidelines for Administering Chemotherapy Drugs by Using AGREE II Tool
Revision:	[1]

Files Checking:

[Manuscript Files: Not OK]

Q: Ethical and Legal Considerations. ***R:*** *Done in page 12 at the fourth paragraph*.

Q: Conflict of Interests. ***R:*** *Done in page 12 at the fifth paragraph*.

Style Checking:

[Article Standard: Not OK]

- Revision

Q: You must reply to all **reviewers' comments (comments on rev.0)** one by one with line number and numbering. ***R:*** It has been done completely.

Thank You

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) 30 May 2019

Dear AE,
When the type of the study change to Review Article they should not include Discussion part in the essay, so they should omit this section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 May 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** (1) 1 Jun 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.

Journal:	International Journal of Cancer Management
Manuscript ID:	91020
Title:	The Critical Assessment of the Quality of Common Clinical Guidelines for Administering Chemotherapy Drugs by Using AGREE II Tool
Revision:	[1]

Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript to the journal. We would like to inform you that the peer review of your manuscript is now completed and despite several useful points, it needs "**Minor Revision**". Below you may find the peer review comments. Please reply to them one-by-one and re-submit it again.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Q: *When the type of your study change to Review Article you should not include Discussion part in the essay, so omit this section.*

R: The discussion part was omitted.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Q: *When the type of your study change to Review Article you should not include Discussion part in the essay, so omit this section.*

R: The discussion part was omitted.

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) 21 Jul 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** (2) 22 Jul 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 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.