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.98879
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(5); e98879

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Pectoral Nerves Blocks on Narcotic Consumption and Pain Intensity in the Patients Undergoing Breast Cancer Surgery"

Author(s): Alireza Mirkheshti, Elham Memary, Shahram Sayyadi, Majid Samsami, Seyed Hassan Motevalli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	19 Jan 2020
Accepted Date:	2 Feb 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 1 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The topic could be an interesting one. However, some problems in the manuscript should be considered for revising.
- The introduction should be revised. It's not clear what the problem is and why conducting the research is necessary.
- Actually, Researcher should explain which novelty exists in this study and why this is important?
- The methods and materials section has some problems that should be explained.
If it's a blind trial study, it should be explained how it has been blinded?
- Including and Excluding criteria have not been explained clearly. What is the intent of "SAME GRADE" in this section? Histologic nuclear grade? Or stage, maybe? Please explain.
- There is nothing about Axillary surgery as a part of breast cancer surgery. The researcher should explain which type of axillary surgery has been done in this study. How long has the procedure taken, and how much has it increased the time of surgery?

- Why is there no group without intervention? (without injection under US)
- It seems this study wants to prove the positive effect of PECS anesthesia versus G.A alone. If it is right then the researcher should create a group without intervention. Indeed, the control group has not been designed correctly. There is no suggestion for further research.
- The manuscript should be edited by a native translator.

Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 8 Dec 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**)** 9 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. 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 chief Editor

Thank you very much for your e-mail dated 9 Dec. 2019 having the referee's comments about our manuscript entitled " **The Effect of pectoral nerves blocks on narcotic consumption and pain intensity in the patients undergoing breast cancer surgery**", which you submitted to International Journal of Cancer Management. By Mirkheshti et al". In response to the comments and suggestions in your letter of 9th Dec 2019, I would like to thank you and the referees for your valuable point of views and suggestions. Our changes in the text in response to referee are shown yellow. **Q** is the question or suggestion raised by each of the respected referee and **Answer** is our explanation in response to the respected referee's suggestion.

With the best wishes and good luck

Response to respected reviewers:

Q1: The topic could be an interesting one however there are some problems in manuscript which should be considered for revising.The introduction should be revised. It's not clear what the problem is and why conducting the research is necessary. *Actually, Researcher should explain which novelty exists in this study and why this is important?*

Answer: We would like to thank the respected referee for his/her encouraging point of views. And the introduction section was revised as the respected referee suggested.

Q2: The methods and materials section has some problems that should be explained. If it's a blind trial study, it should be explained how it has been blinded?

Answer: A person who assessed the pain was blind in this study.

Q3: Including and Excluding criteria have not been explained clearly.

Answer: Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added to the revised version as the respected referee suggested.

Q4: What is the intent of "SAME GRADE" in this section? Histologic nuclear grade? Or stage may be? Please explain.

Answer: It was added to the revised version.

Q5: There is nothing about Axillary surgery as a part of breast cancer surgery. Researcher should explain which type of axillary surgery has been done in this study. How long has the procedure taken and how much has it increased the time of surgery?

	Control (mean ±SD)	PECS (mean ±SD)
Time of surgery(min)	123.18(31.72)	117.92(27.58)

Answer: It was added to the revised version.

Q6: Why is there no group without intervention?(without injection under US) It seems this study wants to prove positive effect of PECS anesthesia versus G.A alone. If it is right then the researcher should create a group without intervention. Indeed, the control group has not been designed correctly.

Answer: In this study general anesthesia with and without PECS was investigated.

Q7: There is no suggestion for further research.

Answer: Further study is needed to investigate the various drugs effect as well as using of catheter for pain control.

Q7: The manuscript should be edited by a native translator.

Answer: The manuscript was edited by an English native speaker as the respected referee suggested.

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) 21 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
With regards, the manuscript by the title of " The Effect of pectoral nerves blocks on narcotic consumption and pain intensity in the patients undergoing breast cancer surgery " was reviewed.
My conclusion is accepted.
Thanks.

Farid Moradian: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Despite the valuable review that was performed by the reviewer due to my review, I think there is no problem with further steps of publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 Feb 2020

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.