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.94909
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(12); e94909

Peer Review Report for "Crocin Enhances Cisplatin-Induced Chemosensitivity in Human Cervical Cancer Cell Line"

Author(s): Homa Mollaei, Reyhane Hoshyar, Mohammad Reza Abedini, Reza Safaralizadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 1 Sep 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)

10 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for forwarding the manuscript entitled “Crocin Enhances Cisplatin-induced Chemosensitivity in Human Cervical Cancer Cell Line”. In my view, the author has done a very good scientific study. However, the manuscript requires corrections.
1- The article title reflects the content appropriately and is properly selected.
2- Abstract provides an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found.
3- Scientific background and rationale for investigation are explained, well.
4- Key elements of the study design are early in the paper.
5- Please describe the potential source of bias in the study, if exists.
6- Is there any excluded data in your study? Explain If the answer is yes.
7- Details of methods of assessments are described properly.
8- Key results in discussion are mentioned carefully.
9- It is expected to discuss the limitation of the study.
10. The paper has some grammatical and typo errors.
Best regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Jul 2019

Dear AE,

Thank you for submitting this interesting manuscript,

- The topic and the work is so interesting and interpreted in detail. Except few grammatical errors in lines 124,152,167 and 171, the text is written well and fluent. In the discussion section, line 158, as I understood, combination therapy of crocin with CDDP should have been reduced the IC50 values.
- 158 of CDDP from 2.7 to 1.5 mg/ml NOT OF CROCIN.
- Sufficient value for publication after minor revision.

Thanks.

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

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 20 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.

RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

We thank the reviewers for the time they have taken in assessing the acceptability of this manuscript, and for their helpful suggestions. We have taken their concerns into consideration and our responses to the specific comments from the reviewers are provided hereafter.

Reviewer 1:
Q*: Thank you for submitting this interesting manuscript,*
The topic and the work is so interesting and interpreted in details. Except few grammatical errors in lines 124,152,167 and 171, the text is written well and fluent.

R: We thank the reviewer # 1 and are glad that our manuscript was adequately acceptable for him/her.

We appreciate the reviewer for bringing this notion to our attention, we have gone through the manuscript and also corrected the typo and grammatical errors. We think that the English level of the manuscript has been improved as well.

Q*: In discussion section, line 158, as I understood, combination therapy of crocin with CDDP should have been reduced the IC50 values*
158 of CDDP from 2.7 to 1.5 mg/ml NOT OF CROCIN.
Sufficient value for publication after minor revision.

R: We have previously reported the anti-proliferative and apoptotic activities of crocin on sensitive and resistant cervical cancer cells, and in the present study demonstrated that combination therapy of crocin and CDDP reduced the IC50 values of crocin from 2.7 to 1.5 mg/ml (48 h) and from 1.5 to 1 mg/ml (72 h). Therefore, the text on line 158 is correct.

Reviewer 2:
July 10, 2019
Dear Associate Editor,
Thank you for forwarding the manuscript entitled "Crocin Enhances Cisplatin-induced Chemosensitivity in Human Cervical Cancer Cell Line". In my view the author have done a very good scientific study. However, the manuscript requires corrections.

Q ***1-Article title reflects the content appropriately and is properly selected.***

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q ***2- Abstract provides informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found.***

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q *3-Scientific background and rationale for investigation is explained, well.*

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q *4-Key elements of study design are early in paper.*

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q *5-Please describe potential source of bias in study, if exists.*

R: None of the requested data are applicable for the current study.

Q *6-Is there any excluded data in your study? Explain If the answer is yes.*

R: None of the requested data are applicable for the current study.

Q *7-Details of methods of assessments are described properly.*

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q *8- Key results in discussion are mentioned carefully.*

R: We thank the reviewer # 2 and are glad that our responses was adequately informative and acceptable for him/her.

Q *9-It is expected discuss limitation of study.*

R: None of the requested data are applicable for the current study.

Q *10. The paper have some grammatical and typo errors.*

R: We have gone through the manuscript and also corrected the typo and grammatical errors. We think that the English level of the manuscript has been improved as well.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Authors,

Please revise the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.

RESPONSE: We thank you and the reviewers for the constructive comments and helpful suggestions and have taken their concerns into consideration and our responses to the specific comments from the reviewers are provided above.

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) 17 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I went through the revised paper and referee report along with the authors reply very carefully.
Since the authors have presented an interesting subject and new idea that has been explored by advanced laboratory tests, so in my view, the publication of this article can be a basis for future research in the field of cancer treatment.
Best regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for replying to the questions. I should declare that I'm not still satisfied with your reply to Q2. As the manuscript title runs, crocin enhances the cisplatin chemosensitivity, so it is expected that less concentration of cisplatin is needed for the same effect.
But in discussion line 158, you say that IC50 (that is drug concentration) of crocin is reduced while I was waiting to hear that IC50 of cisplatin would be reduced. Please explain more if there is a misunderstanding for me.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Oct 2019

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

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