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.93300
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(11); e93300

Peer Review Report for "Gene Expression of *ABCG1*, *ABCG2*, and *ABCB1* and Their Role in Iranian Pediatric Patients with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia's Recurrence"

Author(s): Narjes Mehrvar, Mohammad Reza Rezvany, Hassan Abolghasemi, Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari , Javad Sabery Nejad, Azim Mehrvar, Mohammad Faranoush, Maryam Gheidi Shahran, Abolfazl Movafagh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 May 2019
Revised Date:	4 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	4 Sep 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) 5 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments to the authors:
1- The p value of the obtained results should be mentioned in the abstract and they are also explained in the results.
2- The objective should be merged with the introduction.
3- The primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the mRNA sequence of other genes. What is the explanation of the authors for it? It was accompanied with the error in the obtained results.
Furthermore, it could be matched with the DNA sequence of other genes and they produced the product with the size less than 1000bp. Why the authors do not use the DNase I treatment?
4- Why did the authors use the ANOVA test for the statistical analysis? Why did not they use t-test?
5- The authors expressed that the amplification efficiency in this study was 0.98. This

amplification efficiency was very low.

6- The figure 1 was wrong. The relative expression of GAPDH should not be determined. The expression of this gene was used to normalize of the expression of target genes.

7- Discussion has been badly written. The authors should revise it.

8- The authors should use the pffafl method (not Livak method). The livak method had the less precision than the pfaffl method in the analysis of the results.

8- There were many grammar errors. The authors should edit the English of text.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 6 Jul 2019

Dear Author

Please revise your manuscript according to the comments and resubmit again.

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.

07 July 2019

To dear Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari,

Editor in chief of the International Journal of Cancer Management

Re: Gene expression of ABCG1, ABCG2 and ABCB1: their role in Iranian pediatric patients with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia's recurrence

Authors thank editor and respected reviewers for spending their valuable times to evaluate this manuscript. Below are the responses for each comment which are also highlighted as yellow in the text. Hope this version has the enough quality for publishing in the mentioned journal.

Comments to the authors:

1- **The p value of the obtained results should be mentioned in the abstract and they are also explained in the results.**

Response:

Authors thank for this useful comment. The P-values added in the result section of the abstract and the last part of the results in the main text. Also these sentences highlighted as yellow.

2- **The objective should be merged with the introduction.**

Response:

Authors thank for this comment. The objective merged with the title in the abstract and objectives sections and highlighted as yellow.

3- **The primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the mRNA sequence of other genes. What is the explanation of the authors for it? It was accompanied with the error in the obtained results.**
Furthermore, it could be matched with the DNA sequence of other genes and they produced the product with the size less than 1000bp. Why the authors do not use the DNase I treatment?

Response:

Sequences of primers and GAPDH were checked by primer blast from NCBI. Also we used GAPDH for normalization the samples from a reference paper. The reference cited in the text in the Real Time PCR section of the Methods and highlighted as yellow.

Because of good concentration of extracted RNA which was approved by Nano drop, we didn't use DNase I treatment.

4- **Why did the authors use the ANOVA test for the statistical analysis? Why did not they use t-test?**

Response:

Thank you very much indeed for this comment. There was a mistake during writing the manuscript. We designed to analyze the data by ANOVA, but then realized that the best test is T-Test for analyses. We had been writing in the results that T-test showed significant relation, but it was written in the method as ANOVA. So we rewrote it as T-Test in the statistical section of the method and highlighted it as yellow.

5- **The authors expressed that the amplification efficiency in this study was 0.98. This amplification efficiency was very low.**

Response:

The authors by writing 0.98 and 0.96 for efficiency meant 98% and 96% respectively. According to the cited paper the efficiency more than 90% is desirable for RT-PCR. The reworded sentence highlighted in the text in the expression section of methods.

6- **The figure 1 was wrong. The relative expression of GAPDH should not be determined. The expression of this gene was used to normalize of the expression of target genes.**

Response:

Authors thank for this useful comment. The figure changed and corrected.

7- **Discussion has been badly written. The authors should revise it.**

Response:

Discussion revised and reworded.

8- **The authors should use the pffafl method (not Livak method). The livak method had the less precision than the pfaffl method in the analysis of the results.**

Response:

Thank you very much for this comment. The analysis done by pffafl method and the results added in the text instead of livak.

9- **There were many grammar errors. The authors should edit the English of text.**

Response:

According to this comment we rechecked the manuscript and edited some sentences.

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) 7 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,

1- The primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the mRNA sequence of other genes. It was accompanied by the error in the obtained results. The response of the authors is not convincing.

2- Furthermore, the primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the DNA sequence of other genes and it produced the products with a size less than 1000bp. The response of the authors is not convincing about do not using the DNase I treatment.

3- Figure 1 did not have any axis titles.

4- There were many grammar errors yet. The authors should edit the English of text.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Aug 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to 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.

07 July 2019

To dear Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari,

Editor in chief of the International Journal of Cancer Management

Re: Gene expression of ABCG1, ABCG2 and ABCB1: their role in Iranian pediatric patients with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia's recurrence

Authors thank editor and respected reviewers for spending their valuable times to evaluate this manuscript. Below are the responses for each comment which are also highlighted as yellow in the text. Hope this version has the enough quality for publishing in the mentioned journal.

Comments to the authors:

1. **The primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the mRNA sequence of other genes. It was accompanied with the error in the obtained results. The response of the *authors is not convincing*.**

Response:

Dear reviewer thank you for your comment. GAPDH was used as an internal control housekeeping gene for normalization of samples according to the latest publication which confirmed of using GAPDH in peripheral blood samples of patients with ALL. This reference added in the text and highlighted as yellow. Also as previously clarified sequences of primers and GAPDH were checked by primer blast from NCBI. So surely there were not any mismatch through RT-PCR. According to the mentioned paper the best internal housekeeping gene in peripheral blood samples of patients with ALL is GAPDH.

2. **Furthermore, the primer sequence of GAPDH could be matched with the DNA sequence of other genes and it produced the products with the size less than 1000bp. The response of the authors is not convincing about do not using the DNase I treatment.**

Response:

we didn't use DNase I treatment because of two points: a) the primers were exon junction primers so we were sure that there will not any other products, b) using DNase I will somehow decrease the yield of extracted RNA and we didn't want to make a risk and decrease the RNA.

3. **The figure 1 did not have any axis titles.**

Response:

Thank you for this note. The titles added.

4. **There were many grammar errors yet. The authors should edit the English of text.**

Response:

The manuscript rechecked by a native English editor.

Thank for this 4 comments. The authors are sure that these comments improved the quality of the paper more than before.

Corresponding author

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) 14 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
This manuscript describes a study on expression of three ABC genes in acute lymphoblastic leukemia and its association with recurrence. Points to address are:
1. Every abbreviation should be defined, when they are used for the first time in the abstract, such as VCR, DNR, L-ASP.
2. The methodology of the study is not clear. In the methods section, it is mentioned that "the study was conducted as a prospective case-control". Case-control studies are categorized as retrospective studies. This study is either case-control and retrospective or cohort and prospective. The manuscript is written with a mixture of prospective and retrospective points. The manuscript should be revised in this regard. I recommend that the authors consult a biostatistician.
3. The manuscript needs English language editing.
Thanks.

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.

15 Aug 2019

To dear Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari,

Editor in chief of the International Journal of Cancer Management

Re: Gene expression of ABCG1, ABCG2 and ABCB1: their role in Iranian pediatric patients with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia's recurrence

Authors thank editor and respected reviewers for spending their valuable times to evaluate this manuscript. Below are the responses for each comment which are also highlighted as yellow in the text. Hope this version has the enough quality for publishing in the mentioned journal.

Comments to the authors:

1. **Every abbreviation should be defined, when they are used for the first time in the abstract, such as VCR, DNR, L-ASP.**

Response:

Thank you for this scientific comment. All of the abbreviations were defined in introduction and material methods for the first time even name of drugs. Because of this comment the abbreviations again rechecked for any missing and found that the drugs' definitions were missed in the abstract. So thank you very much indeed. This correction highlighted as yellow in the abstract.

2. **The methodology of the study is not clear. In the methods section, it is mentioned that "the study was conducted as a prospective case-control". Case-control studies are categorized as retrospective studies. This study is either case-control and retrospective or cohort and prospective. The manuscript is written with a mixture of prospective and retrospective points. The manuscript should be revised with this regard. I recommend that the authors consult a biostatistician.**

Response:

Thank you many times for your valuable note. According to discussion with an epidemiologist and another biostatistician at Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences and Cancer Research Center, they confirmed that this study is just a case control designing project and we should delete prospective from the method. Their comment corrected in the text and highlighted as yellow.

3. **The manuscript needs English language editing.**

Response:

The manuscript sent to grammarly software for editing grammatically.

Thank for these comments. The authors are sure that these comments improved the quality of the paper more than before.

Corresponding author

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) 4 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of at least the first and corresponding authors in 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 (4)

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.

04 Sep 2019

To dear Prof. Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari,

Editor in chief of the International Journal of Cancer Management

Re: Gene expression of ABCG1, ABCG2 and ABCB1: their role in Iranian pediatric patients with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia's recurrence

Authors thank editor and respected reviewers for spending their valuable times to evaluate this manuscript. The orcid number of some authors added in the submitting process.

Corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 4 Sep 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.