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.94547
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(8); e94547

Peer Review Report for "Comparing the Outcome of Boost Dose of Intraoperative Radiotherapy with Electron (IOERT) and Low-kV X-Ray (IOXRT) and External Beam Radiotherapy (EBRT) in Breast Cancer After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy"

Author(s): Nazi Moini, Nahid Nafissi, Ebrahim Babaee, Hamidreza Mirzaei, Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 May 2019
Revised Date:	9 Jun 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the author for the excellent comparison.
I think there is a selection bias in the study, the authors have a hypothesis infavor of IORT priority than external beam boost radiotherapy and in discution and conclusion mentioned this priority.
Although such priority is rational and approved and scentific but in the study patients that had undervent external beam had worse biologic,clinical and stage conditions that affect outcomes,so this is a remarkable deficit that need further study in future or new study design or specific discussion,
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jun 2019

Dear Author,

Please revise your manuscript according to the comments and resubmit 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.

Hello

Thank you for on time and excellent comments

1. In this study patients were unselected but in analysis [table 1 and in results (blue high light)] there were no significant difference in stage, hormone receptor, her2, LVI between three groups
2. I agree with you that further studies in future must be done with larger samples and I added it to paper (yellow high light) as your comments.

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) — 11 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
Discussion was completed & limitations were considered for further such studies in the future.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 21 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
- DOI & PMID must be added for each reference.
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) — 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.