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.92798
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(4); e92798

Peer Review Report for "A Comparative Matched Study of Breast-Conserving Therapy and Modified Radical Mastectomy in Iranian Women"

Author(s): Mohammad Houshyari, Afshin Rakhsha, Mohammadreza Khademi, Amir Shahram Yousefi Kashi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 May 2019
Revised Date: 22 May 2019
Accepted Date: 20 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

12 May 2019

Dear AE,
My comments are as follows:
1) Article TITLE is properly selected.
2) The title reflects the content appropriately.
3) There is no abbreviation in the TITLE.
4) Authors' names and institutional affiliations mentioned according to the journal style.
5) There are about 233 words in the ABSTRACT and the word count is in a suitable range.
6) The abstract describes the content accurately.
7) INTRODUCTION is fair and does include: "What we know", "What we don't know" and "Aims".
8) Abbreviations are defined the first time they appear in the text.
9) The manuscript contains Ethical Considerations.
10) The methodology is GOOD.
11) In the MATERIALS and METHODS section, Study design in the Methods part mentioned.
12) There is not any repetition in the tables and the text in the results part.
13) There are not any English mistakes in this article.

14) The results are very conclusive.
15) -The Conclusion is very good.
16) The REFERENCES, proper writing and are appropriate and according to journal instructions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 17 May 2019

Dear AE,
1- DOI & PMID must be added for the each reference.
2- Some of the references had not been written according to the journal policy.
3- What was your sampling method?
4- Inclusion/exclusion criteria were not appropriately defined.
5- The word " with" in line 7 in the discussion part must be omitted.
6- It is better to write the main result(s) of your article as the first line in the discussion section and then mention to the other studies.
7- The aim of your essay should be defined in the first line of the conclusion part.
8- The conclusion sector should be included as the last paragraph of the discussion,not apart of that.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 19 May 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise your manuscript according to the comments and resubmit again.
Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 19 May 2019

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewer's comments your manuscript needs some revision. please resubmit your manuscript after the revision.
Thank you

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 Editorial team of International Journal of Cancer management

Reply to Reviewer 1

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Reviewer 1:
1-DOI & PMID must be added for the each reference.

It`s done
2- Some of the references had not been written according to the journal policy.

It`s done
3-What was your sampling method?

Our sampling method was a time- stratified1:1 approach of whole patients.
4-Inclusion/exclusion criteria were not appropriately defined.

Our exclusion criteria were: Breast cancer patients who did not have acceptable follow up after initial diagnosis, metastatic patients, patients who were without pathologic diagnosis. Our inclusion criteria were: Breast cancer patients with stage I to III who had acceptable follow up after initial diagnosis and had all 10 baseline variables (age at diagnosis, stage of tumor, tumor histology, tumor grade, number of positive nodes, pathologic tumor size, type of chemotherapy ER, PR and HER2 status)

5-The word " with" in line 7 in the discussion part must be omitted.

It`s done
6-It is better to write the main result(s) of your article as the first line in the discussion se ction and then mention to the other studies.

It`s done

7- The aim of your essay should be defined in the first line of the conclusion part.

It`s done
8-The conclusion sector should be included as the last paragraph of the discussion,not apart of that

It`s done

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,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
This manuscript can be considered as an accepted article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 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.