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.95540
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 12(11); e95540

Peer Review Report for "Lymphovascular and Perineural Invasions Are Independently Associated with Advanced Colorectal Carcinoma"

Author(s): Hossein Yahyazadeh, Ahmad R Mafi, Elham Khatooni , Marzieh Beheshti, Azita Abdollahinejad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 5 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 8 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: Reviewer | Revision (0)

4 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- In Methods, define the scientific descriptions for T1-T2-T3-T4.
2- What P-values are significant in this study?
3- Ethical considerations were not seen.
4- The conclusion part must be added as the last paragraph of the discussion section, not apart of that.
5- Proper writing of the references was not observed.
6- DOI & PMID must be added for each reference.
7- For the first line of the conclusion part you should state the aim of the study, and then the main result(s) of your treatise must be declared in line 2 and 3. for the rest of this part you can explain any comment, hypothesis or answer to any question.
8- Don't you have any Acknowledgment? Conflict of interest?Author`s contributions in this paper?!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,

There are some comments to the authors:

1- In Methods, define the scientific descriptions for: T1-T2-T3-T4

2- What P-values are significant in this study?

3- Ethical considerations were not seen.

4- The conclusion part must be added as the last paragraph of the discussion section, not apart of that.

5- Proper writing of the references was not observed.

6- DOI & PMID must be added for the each reference.

7- For the first line of conclusion part you should state the aim of the study, and then the main result(s) of your treatise must be declared in line 2 and 3. for the rest of this part you can explain any comment, hypothesis or answer to any question.

8- Don`t you have any Acknowledgment? Conflict of interest?Author`s contributions in this paper?!

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Aug 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.

Dear Prof Akbari

Many thanks for your email. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments, and have highlighted the changes within the manuscript. As requested, we have addressed all the comments one by one:

Comment 1: In Methods, define the scientific descriptions for: T1-T2-T3-T4

Answer: We have defined the T-stage and have highlighted it in the text.

Comment 2: What P-values are significant in this study?

Answer: P≤0.05 was considered as significant. It has been added and highlighted in the text.

Comment 3: Ethical considerations were not seen.

Answer: Ethical considerations has been added and highlighted in the text.

Comment 4: Conclusion part must be added as the last paragraph of the discussion section, not apart of that.

Answer: Conclusion has changed accordingly.

Comment 5: Proper writing of the references was not observed.

Answer: References have changed accordingly.

Comment 6: DOI & PMID must be added for the each reference.

Answer: References have been changed accordingly.

Comment 7: For first line of conclusion part you should state the aim of the study, and then the main result(s) of your treatise must be declared in line 2 and 3. For the rest of this part you can explain any comment, hypothesis or answer to any question.

Answer: Conclusion has changed accordingly.

Comment 8: Don`t you have any Acknowledgment? Conflict of interest? Author`s contributions in this paper?

Answer: Acknowledgment, Conflict of interest and Author`s contributions have been added and highlighted in the text.

We would be grateful if you could consider our manuscript for publication in your journal.

Yours Sincerely

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) 29 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments to the author:
1- Ethical considerations (code or the number) according to your institute were not seen.
2- The conclusion part should be added as the last paragraph of the discussion, not apart of that.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 Aug 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 31 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Abbreviations should be used sparingly and must be introduced in parentheses upon the first mention in both abstract and full text.
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.

Dear Prof Akbari

Many thanks for your email. We have revised the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments, and have highlighted the changes within the manuscript. As requested, we have addressed all the comments one by one:

Reviewer 1:
1-Ethical considerations (code or the number) according to your institute were not seen.

Answer: Ethical considerations documents are attached.

2-Conclusion part should be added as the last paragraph of the discussion, not apart of that.

Answer: Conclusion has changed accordingly (I have copied the style from one of the recently published articles of the journal).

EIC Decision:

Abbreviations should be used sparingly and must be introduced in parentheses upon the first mention in both abstract and full text.

Answer: Abbreviations have been introduced and highlighted in the text.

We would be grateful if you could consider our manuscript for publication in your journal.

Yours Sincerely

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) 8 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.