Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Volume 12 · Issue 2 · e114298

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Relationship Between Cytokeratin 7 Expression with Some Prognostic Factors in Gastric and Colorectal Adenocarcinomas

Reyhan Salimi, Shahram Bagheri, neda parvin, Esrafil Mansouri, Maryam Seyedtabib

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
6 Apr 2021	24 May 2021	24 May 2021	10.5812/jjcmb.114298

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Hadi Parsian, Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 12

1 Original submission

5 comments · 11 Apr 2021 – 13 Apr 2021

Hadi Parsian Reviewer

REJECT 11 Apr 2021

The manuscript entitled “Determination of the relationship between expression of cytokeratin 7 with prognostic factors in the adenocarcinoma of the gastric and colorectal” has no novelty, as Jalali-Nadooshan et al. (2015) previously published an article on this topic. Therefore, I don’t recommend this manuscript for publication.

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 11 Apr 2021

- In this work, the authors claimed to have determined the association between cytokine 7 and prognostic factors. The design and assumptions provided by the authors may be interesting, but some parts of the work suffer from shortcomings.
- The English language needs to be polished and edited. A number of grammatical, writing, and alphabetical errors need to be corrected.
- Prognostic factors have been claimed to have been studied, but it is not clear how these factors have been defined or measured/evaluated, as the relationship between these factors and patient survival has not been investigated in this study.
- The study methods and data analysis are not well explained. Also, the results/findings have not been presented properly. In addition, it is strongly suggested that the authors provide appropriate figures corresponding to the findings.
- Clinicopathological characteristics of patients should preferably be presented in tabular form.
- In the discussion section, some sentences are written vaguely. Since the results of the study are negative, the work can be completed for publication by providing a proper comparative analysis, scientific evidence, and appropriate justification.
- References should be presented consistently and in accordance with the standard format of the journal.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 13 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled "Determination of the relationship between expression of cytokeratin 7 with prognostic factors in the adenocarcinoma of the gastric and colorectal" to Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology. Below, please find the comments, which I hope will be constructive and helpful.

1. Title: Considering your results, the selected title is no longer suitable for this manuscript, and other titles, such as "Evaluation of the relationship between expression of cytokeratin 7 with some prognostic factors in the gastric and colorectal adenocarcinoma", may be more consistent with the results.
2. Introduction:
a) The discussion is too short, whereas the introduction is too long, and both the introduction and the discussion should be revised again.
b) The aim of the study, in the last paragraph of the introduction, should be changed. You mentioned "

malignancy": instead of "determine", you should use "evaluate"; "the frequency of cytokeratin 7 gene expression" should be changed to "the cytokeratin 7 expression level"; and "tumor stage" should be removed because you did not assess this factor in your study.
3. Methods: You should provide more detail in this section. You could add subsections such as "Case selection and tissue samples", "Immunohistochemistry", and "Statistical analysis" and explain each of them separately, in more detail.
4. Results:
a) In the present study, the number of samples (for each type of cancer) was too small, and the results may not reflect reality. Perhaps because of this limitation, your results are not in agreement with most of the articles on this topic. CK20 assessment, alongside CK7 assessment, may help ensure the reliability of the present results.
b) Unfortunately, there were no figures or tables related to your results. Some pictures of "the normal colonic/gastric epithelium with cytokeratin 7" and "CK7 immunopositivity tissues" and some tables that show "the relation between the expression of CK7 in those cancer tissues with their histopathologic and clinical characteristics" should be added.
5. Discussion: The discussion is not comprehensive and informative enough. The length of this important section is too short, and the number of references is very low. More references should be added to the discussion section.

Thank you again for submitting your work.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 13 Apr 2021

In accordance with the forwarded comments, this manuscript needs a major revision. To avoid an additional revision, correct and revise the manuscript point by point in accordance with the reviewers' comments.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 13 Apr 2021

Dear Authors
In light of the reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs a major revision. Revise it carefully. All comments must be addressed in the response-to-reviewers file and in the revised manuscript. The ORCIDs of all authors must be included in the revision. The funding source and ethical approval must be clearly stated in the revised manuscript. The figure must be referenced in the results section, and providing a legend for each figure is mandatory.
Best, EIC
Dr. Mard

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor, Here is our Response to Reviewer's comments:

The corrected parts are painted red in the article.

Reviewer No.1:

1. Title: corrected, line 1
2. Introduction: a) corrected, line 3-46 b) corrected line 46
3. Methods: corrected, line 50-84
4. Results: a). It was not done due to high costs and sanctions

   b) corrected, line 108-110

5. Discussion: corrected, line 182-188

.

Reviewer No.3:

1. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
2. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
3. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
4. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
5. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
6. Corrected, **painted red in the article**
7. Corrected, **painted red in the article**

Best Regards

Dr bagheri

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 4 May 2021 – 4 May 2021

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 May 2021

Dear Author,
Thank you again for submitting your manuscript entitled "Determination of the relationship between expression of cytokeratin 7 with prognostic factors in the adenocarcinoma of the gastric and colorectal" to Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology. Below, please find the comments and revise the manuscript accordingly:
- The "Abstract" section should be revised completely according to the new changes.
- The introduction is still too long (≤500 words) and should be revised again.
- Unfortunately, the presentation of results/findings has not been done properly. It is strongly suggested that you provide appropriate tables corresponding to the findings. It seems you just copied and pasted the SPSS tables. Please put appropriate tables in standard form and also mention them in the appropriate places in the results section.
- The discussion is not comprehensive and informative enough. Your results are negative, so a proper comparative analysis, supported by scientific evidence and appropriate justification, is needed. The number of references is very low, and more references should be added to the discussion section. References should be provided consistently and in accordance with the standard format of the journal.
- The English language still needs to be polished and edited. A number of grammatical, writing, and alphabetical errors need to be corrected.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 4 May 2021

A minor revision is needed

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 4 May 2021

Dear Dr. Salimi
Your manuscript is provisionally accepted for publication in JJCMB, but there are still minor concerns that need to be addressed. Please revise your manuscript in accordance with the final reviewer comments to avoid further revision.
EIC, Dr. Mard

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor, Here is our Response to Reviewer's comments:

The corrected parts are painted red yellow in the article.

Reviewer No.3:

Q1: [abstract revised], R1: [performed], line number : edited in abstract line 22-30

Q2: [introduction revised to <500 words], R2: [performed]

Q3: [tables edited], R3: [performed], line number : edited all tables in appendix file

Q4: [discussion edited], R3: [performed], line number : 167-172, 178-184, 203-211

Best Regards

Dr bagheri

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 22 May 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 22 May 2021

Corrections were made by the authors, but the number of tables has to be reduced to a reasonable number.

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editor, Here is our Response to Reviewer's comments:

The corrected parts are painted red yellow in the article.

Reviewer 1:

Q1: [table reduce], R1: [performed], edited in table file

Q2: [some grammatical errors through the text which should be improved.], R2: [performed], line number:40-66

Best Regards

Dr bagheri

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 24 May 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 May 2021

Dear Dr. Bagheri
Having read the last revision, I realized that all questions raised by the final reviewer were addressed in it.
Therefore, I agree to accept.
Best Regards
EIC, Dr. Mard