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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.96683
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(8); e96683

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of BECN1 Gene Expression in Remission-Induction Therapy of Acute Myeloid Leukemia"

Author(s): Parisa Tandel, Eqbal Ebrahimi, Mani Ramzi, Alireza Rezvani, Reza Ranjbaran, Gholamhossein Tamaddon

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	8 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	14 Sep 2019

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)

6 Aug 2019

Dear AE,

The manuscript entitled “Evaluation of BECN1 gene expression in remission-induction therapy of acute myeloid leukemia” has been reviewed. The authors have reported significantly higher expression levels of BECN1 gene in AML patients compared with normal controls and also significantly decreased expression levels of BECN1 in AML patients with complete remission compared with newly diagnosed patients. Therefore, they suggest this gene as a biomarker to evaluate remission status and as a new target to improve treatment in AML patients. The manuscript is well written. However, there are some comments as follows:

- There are some grammatical and syntax errors throughout the text, that need to be edited.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the patients and controls have not been mentioned in the manuscript.
- It is better to illustrate the results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics (with the p values) in the table.
- The first few sentences in the discussion are a repetition of the introduction contents. There is no need to repeat.
- In the discussion, the last sentence of the first paragraph is “relapse occur in nearly 60%

of elder patients and >85% of patients" Did you mean > 85% of young patients?
- Since the study populations is very small, any major conclusion and generalization of the findings should be avoided.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 31 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Evaluation of BECN1 gene expression in remission-induction therapy of acute myeloid leukemia" has been reviewed. The authors have reported significantly higher expression levels of BECN1 gene in AML patients compared with normal controls and also significantly decreased expression levels of BECN1 in AML patients with complete remission compared with newly diagnosed patients. Therefore, they suggest this gene as a biomarker to evaluate remission status and as a new target to improve treatment in AML patients. The manuscript is well written. However, there are some comments as follows:
- There are some grammatical and syntax errors throughout the text, that need to be edited.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the patients and controls have not been mentioned in the manuscript.
- It is better to illustrate the results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics (with the p values) in the table.
- The first few sentences in the discussion are a repetition of the introduction contents. There is no need to repeat.
- In the discussion, the last sentence of the first paragraph is "relapse occurs in nearly 60% of elder patients and >85% of patients" Did you mean > 85% of young patients?
- Since the study population is very small, any major conclusion and generalization of the findings should be avoided.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 1 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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 reviewers:

Thanks for your great comments; the mentioned changes have been made:

Reviewers' Comments:

Q: **There are some grammatical and syntax errors throughout the text, that needs to be edited.**

R: This part has been revised. The text of the article has been edited.

Q: **Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the patients and controls have not been mentioned in the manuscript**.

R: This part has been revised. Inclusion criteria for patients and controls have been mentioned.

Q: **It is better to illustrate the results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics (with the p values) in the table.**

R: The tables related to results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics have been added.

Q: **The first few sentences in the discussion are a repetition of the introduction contents. There is no need to repeat**.

R: This part has been revised and these sentences have been removed from discussion part.

Q: **In the discussion, the last sentence of the first paragraph is “relapse occur in nearly 60% of elder patients and >85% of patients” Did you mean > 85% of young patients?**

R: we mean >85% of all AML patients. this part has been revised and we have been explained this sentence in revision.

Q: **Since the study populations is very small, any major conclusion and generalization of the findings should be avoided**.

R: This part has been revised and we avoid from major conclusion and generalization of the findings in revision.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Q: **There are some grammatical and syntax errors throughout the text, that needs to be edited.**

R: This part has been revised. The text of the article has been edited.

Q: **Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the patients and controls have not been mentioned in the manuscript**.

R: This part has been revised. Inclusion criteria for patients and controls have been mentioned.

Q: **It is better to illustrate the results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics (with the p values) in the table.**

R: The tables related to results of the association between BECN1 gene expression and clinical characteristics have been added.

Q: **The first few sentences in the discussion are a repetition of the introduction contents. There is no need to repeat**.

R: This part has been revised and these sentences have been removed from discussion part.

Q: **In the discussion, the last sentence of the first paragraph is "relapse occur in nearly 60% of elder patients and >85% of patients" Did you mean > 85% of young patients?**

R: we mean >85% of all AML patients. this part has been revised and we have been explained this sentence in revision.

Q: **Since the study populations is very small, any major conclusion and generalization of the findings should be avoided**.

R: This part has been revised and we avoid from major conclusion and generalization of the findings in revision.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 14 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.