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.94542
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(2); e94542

Peer Review Report for "*In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Antitumor Activity of Vitamin D3 in Malignant Gliomas: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Melika Hajimohammadebrahim-Ketabforoush, Zahra Vahdat Shariatpanahi, Mohammadreza Shahmohammadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 May 2019
Revised Date: 17 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 21 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
This is a well-designed review, only the studies should be related to each other. They are inconsistently described now. It is recommended to summarize studies in a table too.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
This review study aimed to investigate the antitumor activity of vitamin D3 in malignant gliomas. The subject is interesting, but some major corrections must be made before further considerations:
1- The paper needs to be revised in regards to Scientific writing needs and grammatical errors.
2- Some databases such as the web of science are missing.
3- The search strategy explained in the abstract is not correct.
4- It seems that the authors have mentioned in the title that the different types of vitamin D3 are compared. But no comparison is found in the abstract.

5- The numbers of the related papers seem to be enough to perform a meta-analysis.
6- The included studies must be separated to in-vivo and in-vitro studies.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' comments, the article needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The abstract and full-text structure of your manuscript is not according to the journal standards please correct it according to the bellow sections:
Abstract:
The structured or unstructured abstract of a review article contains the below headings:
Context
Evidence Acquisition
Results
Conclusions
Full Text:
The full text of a review article contains the below sections:
Context: It includes 1 or 2 sentences describing the clinical question or issue and its importance in clinical practice or public health.
Evidence Acquisition: This section describes the data sources, including the research strategies, time of the study, and other sources of the used materials, such as subsequent reference searches of retrieved articles. It explains the methods used for quality assessment and the inclusion of identified articles.
Results: This section addresses the major findings of the review of the clinical issue or topic in an evidence-based, objective, and balanced style, emphasizing the available highest-quality evidence.
Conclusions: It clearly states the conclusions to answer the posed questions, if applicable, based on the conclusions of the available evidence, and it emphasizes how clinicians should apply the current knowledge.
--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 the 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.

It makes us happy that our work has come to your attention. We are appreciate all of "International Journal of Cancer Management" journal's reviewers and editors. Here, we are revised based on reviewer comments:

Dear 1st reviewer, I am completely grateful and pleased for your attention;

1- The paper needs to be revised in regards to Scientific writing needs and grammatical errors.

Response: Thank you for your comment, the English language editing certificate has been sent you along with manuscript.

2- Some databases such as web of science are missing.

Response: According to your valuable comment, all of the available databases such as Web of Science were included.

3- Search strategy explained in the abstract is not correct.

Response: Thank you for your comment, according to your valuable comment, this section has been revised in the abstract and its full manuscript.

4-It seems that the authors have mentioned in the title that the different types of vitamin D3 are compared. But no comparison is found in the abstract.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment, the main purpose of our study was to review the antitumor effects of vitamin D, not to compare its different types. Since studies that examine only vitamin D were scarce, we included studies that used analogs of this vitamin too. We removed this misconception from the title of the manuscript. However, in "conclusions" section, we state that studies using the vitamin D analogs found the same effects and without calcium toxicity.

5-The numbers of the related papers seem to be enough to perform a meta-analysis.

Response: Thank you for your attention, it is worth noting that the articles were divided into two categories: in vitro and in vivo and because of the limited number of articles, both types were included in the present study. Therefore, due to heterogeneity, meta-analysis would not appear to be more accurate than the present study. In addition, the need for meta-analysis workshops is very much felt, and due to the limited time and facilities, this study was design as systematic review from the beginning not as a meta-analysis. However, many studies with simple, narrative review designs have been published in many prestigious journals; this does not appear lack of meta-analysis to be a mere deficit to justify the article.

6- The included studies must be separated to in-vivo and in-vitro studies.

Response: I am thankful for your comment, according to that, in-vivo and in-vitro studies were both separated in the text and in the tables, and reviewed separately.

Dear 2rd reviewer, I am really thankful for your comment;

This is a well designed review, only the studies should be related to each other. They are inconsistently described now. It is recommended to summarize studies in a table too.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment, according to that, interrelated studies were reviewed separately. The article summary table 1 and 2 are also evident in the manuscript.

Dear Associate Editor and EIC, Thank you very much for your attention. Your comments were considered in the present study and the abstract and full-text structure was revised according to the journal standards.

We are enthusiastically hope that these amendments will be accepted by Int J Cancer Manag.
Looking forward hearing from you.
Best Regards
Melika

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.

Saeid Doaei: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Oct 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) 12 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
This manuscript can be considered as an accepted article in the IJCM journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
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 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.

It makes us happy that our work has come to your attention. We are appreciate all of "International Journal of Cancer Management" journal's reviewers and editors.

Reviewer 1:

The required corrections are made.

Response: Dear 1st reviewer, I am completely grateful and pleased that you have accepted the modified version.

Associate Editor 1:

This manuscript can be considered as an accepted article in the IJCM journal.

Response: Dear 1st Associate Editor, we are proud of your comment. Thanks a lot.

EIC Decision:

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

Response: Dear EIC, ORCID id added to author section. Thank you very much.

We are enthusiastically hope that these amendments will be accepted by Int J Cancer Manag.
Looking forward hearing from you.
Best Regards
Melika

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) 21 Oct 2019

Dear Author,

This is my pleasure to announce to 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.