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.99534
Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 13(7); e99534

Peer Review Report for "A Study on the Effects of Polite Yawning Technique on Rehabilitation of Olfaction After Total Laryngectomy"

Author(s): Ehsan Khadivi , Kamran Khazaeni , Leila Vazifeh Mostaan , Maryam Salehi , Iraj Vakili , Seyed Alireza Javadinia, Ahmadreza Ahmadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 15 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Jun 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) — 9 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
1. In the abstract, method part: The authors should put more details about what they did.
2. What is the necessity of lumbar assessment?
3. It does not need to put the name of the article (page 6: Rehabilitation of olfaction after laryngectomy by means of a nasal airflow-inducing maneuver: the
Polite Yawning technique").
4. They should remove all the publication years in the text.
5. They might put the reference at the end of sentences (the last paragraph of the discussion part, reference number 7 and 20).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 14 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise the manuscript according to the reviewer's comments. In addition, please state in the methods section whether "informed" consent was taken from the study participants.

Thanks.

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

14 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to IJCM. Please revise your manuscript according to the reviewer's and associate editor'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 editorial office

RE: Subject: Int J Cancer Manag, manuscript ID: 99534, rev [0], needs Minor Revision

We revised the article based on recommendations of reviewer and Associated editor and highlighted them in the text. Also, you may find the revised parts below.

Regards

Reviewers' comment	Authors' responses	Page
In abstract, method part: please put more details about what you did.	We add more information.	1
What is the necessity of lumbar assessment?	It was a misspelling. We correct it.	3
does not need to put the name of article (page 6: Rehabilitation of olfaction after laryngectomy by means of a nasal airflow-inducing maneuver: the Polite Yawning technique")	We remove the title.	5
please Remove all the publication years in text	We did it.	Whole text
put the reference at the end of sentences (the last paragraph of the discussion part, reference number 7 and 20)	We did it.	Whole text
Associate Editor's Comments:		
please state in the methods section whether "informed" consent was taken from the study participants.	We add the required data.	2

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) 13 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should consider the comments of associate editor in the manuscript and resubmit.
hanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Please consider the comments of associate editor in your manuscript and resubmit.
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 editorial office

RE: Subject: Int J Cancer Manag, manuscript ID: 99534, rev [1], needs Major Revision

We revised the article based on recommendations of reviewer and Associated editor and highlighted them in the text. Also, you may find the revised parts below.

Regards

Reviewers' comment	Authors' responses	Page
Abstract		
it doesn't in the table	We recheck it and it is correct	Table 2, the 4th column, the 5th row
It is different from the table.	We recheck it and it is correct	Table 2, the 5th column, the 6th row
Methods		
if it is the first visit, after total laryngectomy, so how did you have pre operation assessment?	We change the sentence to "During the first preoperative visit" to clarify.	Page 3, Paragraph 2, line 1
clarify and put more information about the tests and the groups after assessments. there are differences between table and the text.	The Quick Odor Detection Test was used and is described compressively.	Page 3, Paragraph 3, all
how long did it take after intervention?	We adde "within first week after intervention"	Page 3, Paragraph 3, last line
where is the results?	We recheck it and it is presented	Table 2, the 5th column, the 6th row
Result		
this part needs to be revised and completed. (more information)	We avoided repeating the data which were presented in the tables and mentioned the most appropriate information.	Result section
There is a difference between omitted patients and the total number of participants.	Out of 50 patients, 40 patients were analyzed. We corrected the sentence.	Result section, Paragraph 1, last 2
this table is not complete	Both tables are complete	Table 1-2
Discussion		
there is not no need to the p vallue	We remove it	

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) 14 Jun 2020

Dear Authors,
Please add the ORCID ID of the first and corresponding authors.
Thanks.

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 editorial office

RE: Subject: Int J Cancer Manag, manuscript ID: 99534, rev [2], needs Minor Revision

We provided the ORCID IDs of first and corresponding authors as your request.

Dr Ehsan Khadivi: 0000-0002-8231-4868

Dr Ahmadreza Ahmadi: 0000-0002-5817-5706

Regards;

Dr Ahmadreza Ahmadi

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) 20 Jun 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.