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.94185
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(9); e94185

Peer Review Report for "The Role of Matrix Metalloproteinase-2 Expression in Gastric Cancer Susceptibility: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Fereshte Bibak, Samane Ahmadi, Zeynab Khateri, Amirhossein Ahmadi, Kheirollah Yari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	21 May 2019
Revised Date:	25 Jul 2019
Accepted Date:	29 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) 13 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Comments to the authors:
1- DOI & PMID must be added for each reference.
2- Appropriateness of writing for the references was not seen.
3- There is an abbreviation in the title: MMP-2.
4- We do not permitted to use any abbreviation without full definition for the first time (both in the abstract and the body): ECM-MMP2.
5- For systematic reviews, both the abstract and body of the manuscript should be subdivided into the following sequential sections:
context-objective-data sources- study selection-data extraction-results-conclusion.
6- For the context provide only 1 to 2 sentences for explaining the importance of the review question.
7- For objective state the precise primary objective of the review.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,

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

2- Appropriateness of writing for the references was not seen.

3- There is an abbreviation in the title:MMP-2.

4- We do not permitted to use any abbreviation without full definition for the first time (both in the abstract and the body): ECM-MMP2.

5- For systematic reviews, both the abstract and body of the manuscript should be subdivided into the following sequential sections:

context-objective-data sources- study selection-data extraction-results-conclusion.

6- For the context provide only 1 to 2 sentences for explaninig the importance of the review question.

7- For objective state the precise primary objective of the review.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 16 Jun 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript based on the comments and resubmit again. Also please add the ORCID id of the manuscript 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 (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 Editor

I would like to thank you and your reviewers for good comments regarding our study, which allow us to improve this manuscript. We insert some parts of these explanations and advice into the manuscript. Answers to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

Many thanks for your suggestions:

1. *DOI & PMID added for each reference.*
2. *References style was adjusted based on Journal format.*
3. *The full definition of abbreviation added.*
4. *Abstract and body of the manuscript subdivided into the sequential sections based on journal format.*
5. Thae manuscript title was revised.
6. *In abstract, context revised for only 1 to 2 sentences for explaining the importance of the review question.*
7. *In the abstract, the objective was revised.*

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) 21 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Comment to the author:
1- Appropriateness of writing for the references according to the journal policy was not seen.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jul 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 24 Jul 2019

Dear Author,
Please add the ORCID id of the manuscript authors in the authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from the ORCID website at https://orcid.org.
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.

Dear Editor

I would like to thank you and your reviewers for good comments regarding our study, which allow us to improve this manuscript. t. Answers to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

Many thanks for your suggestions:

Reviewer 1:

-Appropriateness of writing for the references according to the journal policy was not seen.

Response: References adjusted based on journal format.

EIC Decision:

Please add the ORCID id of the manuscript authors in authors section when submitting the revised manuscript. You can get an ORCID id from ORCID website at https://orcid.org. Thank you.

Response ORCID was added for all authors.

Thanks

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) 29 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.