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.97220
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(5); e97220

Peer Review Report for "The Correlation of Endothelial Nitric Oxide Synthase Gene rs1799983 Polymorphisms with Colorectal Cancer"

Author(s): Azim Adibmanesh, Mahdi Bijanzadeh, Ghorban Mohammadzadeh, Rahim Alidadi, Mojtaba Rashidi, Abdolhassan Talaiezadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 21 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Mar 2020

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)

3 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Authors have assessed the association between a variant within eNOS and the risk of colorectal cancer. The study lacks novelty. The following notes should be addressed:
1. The paper needs to be edited by a native speaker. A few examples of sentences that should be edited are:
a) Colorectal cancer (CRC) has been introduced as the 3rdmost occurring diagnosed cancer.
b) There are two types of colorectal cancer: hereditary colorectal cancer with an incidence of 5-10% and sporadic colorectal cancer with a 90-95% incidence (the word “incidence” is not used properly in this sentence).
c) The impaired endothelial nitric oxide synthase (eNOS) can result in CRC's clinical presentation and its mechanisms.
d) Thermal cycler (25 µl reaction volume) was employed for PCR amplification.
e) The PCR yield was divided into two fragments (What does “yield” mean here?)
f) Studies comparing normal individuals and patients with cancer genetically revealed…
g) … enhances the chance risk of AND several other sentences.
2. The sample size is relatively small for a genetic association study. I recommend

calculation of study power (post Hoc analysis).

3. In statistical methods, why did authors use Student's t-test and the Mann–Whitney U test?

4. As CRC cases were not matched with controls regarding higher BMI, family history of cancer, and alcohol drinking, the results of association analysis with the mentioned SNP is doubtful. So, the conclusion part is not reasonable.

5. The sample size is not enough to conclude, "This result is in line with previous studies in which factors, including smoking, alcohol intake and a history of cancer in family could be attributed to the risk factors for colorectal cancer."

Thanks.

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

4 Sep 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.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear editor
Authors have assessed association between a variant within eNOS and risk of colorectal cancer. The study lacks novelty. The following notes should be addressed:

1. *The paper needs to be edited by a native speaker. A few examples of sentences that should be edited are:*
   a) Colorectal cancer (CRC) has introduced as the 3rdmost occurring diagnosed cancer.
   b) There are two types of colorectal cancer: hereditary colorectal cancer with an incidence of 5-10% and sporadic colorectal cancer with a 90-95% incidence (the word "incidence" is not used properly in this sentence).
   c) The impaired endothelial nitric oxide synthase (eNOS) can result in clinical presentation of CRC and its mechanisms.
   d) Thermal cycler (25 µl reaction volume) was employed for PCR amplification.
   e) The PCR yield was divided into two fragments (What does "yield" mean here?)
   f) Studies comparing normal individuals and patients with cancer genetically revealed

The manuscript was edited by a native speaker, and the certificate was enclosed.

…
g) … enhances the chance risk of AND several other sentences.
2. The sample size is relatively small for a genetic association study. I recommend calculation of study power (post Hoc analysis).

The sample size was determined by the statistical expert according to previous studies. Two published papers with the same sample size are attached. *post Hoc analysis is used for one-way ANOVA*

3. In statistical methods, why did authors use Student's t-test and the Mann–Whitney U test?
Student's t-test was used to compare demographic properties between cancerous and control groups. Mann–Whitney U test was removed.

4. As CRC cases were not matched with controls regarding higher BMI, family history of cancer and alcohol drinking, the results of association analysis with the mentioned SNP is doubtful. So, the conclusion part is not reasonable.

In polymorphism studies, matching of demographic data is not necessary because of the SNP is inherited and environmental factors do not affect it

5. The sample size in not enough to conclude "This result is in line with previous studies in which factors, including smoking, alcohol intake and a history of cancer in family could be attributed to the risk factors for colorectal cancer".

The present study is the first study to investigate the relationship between eNOS polymorphism and colorectal cancer in Iran and So far, no studies have been conducted in this regard in Iran.

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) 17 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,

1- The manuscript needs to be revised by a person familiar with English language.

2- In the discussion, the authors should explain the results published about the association of eNOS polymorphisms with the susceptibility to cancer in the other populations. These results should be compared with the results obtained in this study. For revising the discussion section, please look at https://www.snpedia.com/index.php/Rs1799983.

3- The last sentence of discussion should be the summary of the obtained results and their applications. The authors should correct it.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. Please revise it according to the associate editor's comments. Besides, please add the ORCID ID of the first and main authors. Also, all abbreviations should be defined when used for the first time, both in the abstract and manuscript bodies.

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 reviewer,

First of all, thank you for your time and your valuable comments.

The following changes were made to the manuscript according to the points:

1. the manuscript edited by kowsar publication and certificate enclosed

2.discussion was edited and highlighted in the manuscript.

3. last sentence of discussion was changedand highlighted in the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 23 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors edited the manuscript in a well-liked format according to the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 3 Mar 2020

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 (3)

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 reviewer,

First of all, thank you for your time and your valuable comments.

The following changes were made to the manuscript according to the points:

1. the manuscript edited by kowsar publication and certificate enclosed

2.discussion was edited and highlighted in the manuscript.

3. last sentence of discussion was changedand highlighted in the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 26 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.