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.92661
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(3); e92661

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the Gene Expression of Hedgehog Signaling Pathway Components in Response to Quinacrine in MDA-MB 231 Cells"

Author(s): Mohsen Asadolahi, Abdolrahim Nikzamir, Majid Sirati-Sabet, Reza Mirfakhraie, Siamak Salami, Soroush Darbankhales, Kobra Saket-Kisomi, Saina Ghadiany

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 14 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 15 Feb 2020

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) 4 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
Comments to the author:
1- There are some grammar mistakes. It needs to be revised by a person familiar with English language.
2- The cells were treated for 72 hours. The authors should express why they selected 72 hours.
3- The data related to the 260/280 absorption of the samples should be expressed in the results not the section of the materials and method.
4- The authors should use the pfaffl method for the analysis of real-time data. The 2Δcct method is not very accurate.
5- The melting curve data showed that the product of GAPDT and PTCH1 were probably dimer primers. The more obvious figures from the melting curve should be showed by the authors. Furthermore, they should show the Figure related to the electrophoresis of PCR products on agarose gel.
6- The figure 2 which is about the electrophoresis of RNA products on agarose gel is

removed from the manuscript. It does not need to be showed this figure.
Thanks.

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

4 Aug 2019

Dear Author
Please revise your manuscript according to the comments and resubmit it 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.

October 9, 2019

Manuscript: 92661

Title: ***Evaluation of the Gene Expression of Hedgehog Signaling Pathway Components in Response to Quinacrine in MDA-MB 231 Cells***

Dear Professor Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Editor-in-Chief,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their careful evaluation of the manuscript and their constructive critiques. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments. Below is our point-by-point response to the reviewers' critiques/suggestions:

1- There are some grammar mistakes. It needs to be revised by a person familiar with English language.

The sentence structure and grammar of manuscript has been improved.

2- The cells were treated for 72 hours. The authors should express why they selected 72 hours.

The selected treatment time, 72 hours, was determined based on a pilot study and was the optimum time point for the evaluation of gene expression.

3- The data related to the 260/280 absorption of the samples should be expressed in the results not the section of the materials and method.

This data was moved to the results section.

4- The authors should use the pfaffl method for the analysis of real time data. The 2ΔCCt method is not very accurate.

Real time data analysis was reevaluated using the method of Pfaffl and the results are presented as:

SMO gene expression: fold: −2.1 ± 0.1 and p=0.007

PTCH1 gene expression: fold: -12.5 ± 0.1 and p=0.059

5- The melting curve data showed that the product of GAPDH and PTCH1

were probably dimer primers. The more obvious figures from the melting curve should be showed by the authors. Furthermore, they should show the Figure related to the electrophoresis of PCR products on agarose gel.

The figure with higher resolution of the melting point was replaced (figure 2) and the figure of agarose gel electrophoresis of PCR products is shown in Figure 3, also.

6- The figure 2 which is about the electrophoresis of RNA products on agarose gel is removed from the manuscript. It does not need to be showed this figure.

As the comment, figure 2 (the electrophoresis of RNA products on agarose gel) is taken from the manuscript.

We hope that we have satisfactorily addressed the reviewers' critiques/suggestions, and that our revised manuscript now merits publication in *International Journal of Cancer Management*.

Sincerely,

Correspond author

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 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Comments to the authors:
The text of manuscript needs to be revised. There are the grammar mistakes yet.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Feb 2020

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.