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.91545
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(12); e91545

Peer Review Report for "Analysis of the *Bach2* and *HDAC3* Expression in Iranian Patients with Acute Myeloid Leukemia"

Author(s): Iman Safari, Mahyar Nourian, Hamed Naghoosi, Aida Etemadi, Fatemeh Zeinali, Hasan Jalaeikhoo, Mohsen Rajaeinejad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 7 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Oct 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 May 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
1- The grammar of the manuscript needs to be edited. There are some English errors.
2- In the materials and methods, the statistical analysis should be more explained. It has been described very short.
3- The authors used the 2ΔΔCT for the analysis of expression data. The Corbett Real time PCR machine could determine the amplification efficiency for each reaction. The authors should use the pfaffl method for the analysis of data.
4- In the materials and method section, the authors did not express the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the selection of the controls and the studied patients. They should be explained completely.
5- In the Results section, the authors did not explain whether there was a correlation between demographic characteristics and the expression of the studied genes. They should be added these explanations to the Results section.
6- In the discussion, the authors did not mention the results obtained in the present manuscript. They should compare the obtained results with the previous studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 5 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.

Dear associate editor of the International Journal of Cancer Management journal

We would greatly appreciate the valuable comments of the reviewers for the manuscript entitled “Analysis of Bach2 and HDAC3 expression in Iranian acute myeloid leukemia patients”. Here I should mention that we have tried to meet all the reviewers’ comments. All changes are shown with high light in the text.

Sincerely yours

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) 1 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,

Comments to the authors:

1- The grammar of the manuscript needs to be edited. There are English errors yet.

2- In the materials and methods, why do the authors use both statistical methods including the t-test and one-way ANOVA test? They have different application.

3- The results included only one paragraph. The results should be expanded.

4- In the discussion, the authors should compare the obtained results with the previous studies. We did not find any discussion on the obtained results.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 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.

Dear associate editor of the International Journal of Cancer Management journal

We would greatly appreciate the valuable comments of the reviewers for the manuscript entitled “Analysis of Bach2 and HDAC3 expression in Iranian acute myeloid leukemia patients”. Here I should mention that we have tried to meet all the reviewers’ comments. Changes are specified in the manuscript.

1- Corrected as much as possible grammar and English errors specified in the manuscript.

2-The one-way ANOVA test was not used and was mistakenly written to have been deleted.

3-The results expanded somewhat.

4-Comparison was made with several studies, and added to the discussion.

Sincerely yours

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,
The manuscript needs to be edited by a person familiar with professional English.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 11 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
According to the comments of associate editor your manuscript needs to be edited by a professional English editor.
Also please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in the authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org.
Thank you.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 associate editor of the International Journal of Cancer Management journal

we would greatly appreciate the valuable comments of the reviewers for the manuscript entitled “Analysis of Bach2 and HDAC3 expression in Iranian acute myeloid leukemia patients”. English language editing done by Kowsarcorp.

Sincerely yours

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 12 Oct 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.