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.91388
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(6); e91388

Peer Review Report for "Outcomes and Complications of Double Roux Loop Reconstruction in Pancreaticoduodenectomy: A Single Center Experience"

Author(s): Abolfazl Afsharfard, Barmak Gholizadeh, Behzad Azimi, Mohammad Amin Shahrbaf, Adel Zeinalpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Mar 2019
Revised Date:	23 May 2019
Accepted Date:	26 May 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) — 18 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the author for this valuable article.
- The article contains enough cases and excellent results.
- I think this article needs further discussion about priority of DRRP despite multiple anastomosis because approvement of single roux in valid texes has high international acceptance and your challenging article need complete discussion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 25 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.

In the name of god

Dear reviewer

Thanks o lot for your kind comment on the manuscript

All the ordered changes have been made and I have resubmitted the new form.

In addition, I have added some extra points in discussion part.

Thanks a lot

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) 21 May 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 May 2019

Dear Author,
Your manuscript is considered as an accepted article, It is necessary to add the ORCID id of the main corresponding author, Please add the ORCID id of the manuscript authors in the authors section in the submission process.
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.

In the name of god

Dear reviewer

Thanks o lot for your kind comment on the manuscript

All the ordered changes have been made and I have resubmitted the new form.

And orcid ID for dr. zeinalpour has been added to manuscript

Thanks a lot

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) 26 May 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.