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.98913
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(11); e98913

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Anticancer Effects of Hydroalcoholic Extracts of *Camellia sinensis* and *Lepidium sativum* L on HeLa Cell Line"

Author(s): Somayeh Jahani, Zahra Heidari, Mehdi Azami, Bita Moudi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Dec 2019
Revised Date:	11 Aug 2020
Accepted Date:	16 Aug 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) — 8 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
To the best of my knowledge, plenty of work has been done in the world on the effective ingredient of green tea in inhibiting tumor growth, and in connection with this research, no innovation has been made. In addition, it is recommended to continue using nanotechnology methods in order to innovate.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 4 Aug 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) — 4 Aug 2020

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

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 in-chief

Thanks for the kind comments regarding our manuscript. Reviewer's comments were read carefully, and requested modifications were done according to reviewers' points of view. New changes marked by red color. We hope that this revision of manuscript could qualify it to be published in the" Int J Cancer Manag".

Yours' sincerely

Zahra Heidari.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
As the best of my Knowledge, plenty of works have been done in the world on the effective ingredient of green tea in inhibiting tumor growth, and in connection with this research, no innovation has been made. In addition, it is recommended to continue using nanotechnology methods in order to innovation.

Thank you for your interesting comment. Main goal of current study was to examine the effect of *Camellia Sinensis* and *L. Sativum together as* powerful antioxidants against cancer cells and comparing their effects. Present study investigated the anticancer effects of green tea and cress on HeLa cell line and determined that which of them were more effective on prevention of growth of HeLa cell line. The project budget was very limited and complementary processes were not feasible. In future projects, techniques such as nanotechnology can be evaluated. We added this to the suggestions for future studies.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear authors,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. Points to address are:
1. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, both in the abstract and manuscript body, each one separately, such as FBS in the abstract, IUMS, FBS, DMEM, EDTA, PI, SD, IC50,,... In addition, all abbreviations used in each table, should be defined bellow that table.

Thank you for your nice comment. All abbreviations were defined when they were used for the first time. Also all abbreviations used in each table, were defined bellow that table.

2. In the conclusion section of the abstract, you mention that: "It can be concluded that green tea extract compared with cress had more protective effect against cervical cancer." It is better to change "protective effect" to "cytotoxic effect", which is based on the results of the current study.

It was changed.

3. Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search". "Lepidium Sativum L" is not a MeSH term. "Green Tea" is a MeSH entry, "Tea" should be used instead, which is a MeSH heading. "Cress" is a MeSH entry, "Brassicaceae" should be used instead, which is a MeSH heading. "cervical cancer" is a MeSH entry, "Uterine Cervical Neoplasm" should be used instead, which is a MeSH heading.

It was done.

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) 11 Aug 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Aug 2020

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