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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Cancer Management
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijcm.97892
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 14(6); e97892

Peer Review Report for "Multicentric Study of Clinicopathological Features of Primary Gastrointestinal Lymphoma of Iran: from 2011 - 2016"

Author(s): Farahnaz Bidarizerehpoosh, Samira Ghasemi, Arsham Moradi, Afshin Moradi, Behrang Kazeminezhad, Elena Jamali, Tahmineh Mollasharifi, Kamran Ghaffarzadehgan, Arash Dehghan, Abolfazl Movafagh, Amir Sadeghi, Mahsa Ahadi, Sara Zahedifard, Malihe Saberafsharian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	12 Sep 2020
Revised Date:	16 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	3 May 2021

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)

18 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
- In the introduction lines, 46&47 should be deleted.
- In material&method:in multi-centric study specify the names of the centers.the average number of cancer patients referred to these centers should be determined. and identify the department that collects information in this centers
- In results: surgery is the main of treatment in 80% of patients . It is wonderful !! In GI lymphoma surgery has no role
- In discussion: line 130-135; DLBL Is more common in our country because H.pylori is more common! We know that H-pylori is related to MALT.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Sep 2020

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) 19 Sep 2020

Dear authors,
Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's comments.
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.

Dear editor

Thanks for your email. The following comments have been revised in article.

In introduction line 46&47 have been deleted.
In material method: in multi-centric study specify the names of the centers. The average number of cancer patients referred to these centers should be determined. And identify the department that collects information in this centers have been revised and highlighted.
In results: surgery is the main of treatment in 80% of patients. It is wonderful!! In GI lymphoma surgery has no role. It has been revised.
In discussion: line 130-135; DLBL Is more common in our country because H.pylori is more common! We know that H-pylori is related to MALT. It has been revised.

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) 28 Apr 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 May 2021

Dear Authors,
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