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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.113043
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 19(2); e113043

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of EDTA Buffer and Temperature on DNA Extraction from Teeth for Molecular Forensic Assessment"

Author(s): Mehrdad Nasrollahzadehsabet, Emran Esmeilzadeh, Naeem Shirmohammady , Mohammad Foad Heidari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 25 May 2021
Accepted Date: 25 May 2021

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) — 3 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should check the mentioned items
Thanks.

Rohallah Mirjani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
After eliminating the following shortcomings, this paper can be accepted
1- in the title part use from a tooth or from teeth.
2- in the objective part of the manuscript replace “Iranian commercial kit” with the standard style of introducing chemicals and kits to an article which is the brand name, company, city, and country.
3- the objective part of the manuscript is not clear at all and specifically clarifies you going to camper what vs what.
4- define the STDV in table No.1
5-as my conception, the manuscript is evaluating the effect of EDTA temperature on DNA extracted from the tooth, so I suggest changing the title part of the manuscript to a more

descriptive, direct, and accurate one.

6- The following explanation should be included in the introduction, along with new references and peripherally in a table:

- Various methods of DNA Extraction from Teeth

Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 18 Apr 2021

Dear EIC

The review of this manuscript was finished and overall, a minor revision is suggested. The comments of the reviewer are attached.

Regards

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 18 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,

Comments for the authors:

1. the number of references and word count of the text is lower than for an original article. add more references and edit text (especially discussion) for the original article OR change the manuscript for short communicatin. limit the word count of the abstract to about 250 words for the original article

2. Make changes in the attachment file.

3. Also include the comments of reviewers in it.

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 Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah,
Editor-in-Chief
Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research Journal

My co-authors and I would like to thank you for your consideration and for the constructive comments of the EIC, AE and Reviewers. We believe that it was a great educational opportunity to read your valuable comments. We have revised the paper, based on the comments, making it more complete by adding features to the previous version.

Corresponding Author

Reviewers comments:

Reviewer 1:

After eliminating the following shortcomings, this paper can be accepted.

Comment 1: In the title part use from a tooth or from teeth.

Thank you, title corrected as instructed.

Comment 2: In the objective part of the manuscript replace “Iranian commercial kit” with the standard syle of introducing chemicals and kits to an article which is the brand name, company, city, and country.

Corrected as instructed, “(DNP kit Sina Clone co. Iran)” replace with “Iranian commercial kit” please see, Objective section, paragraph 1.

Comment 3: The objective part of the manuscript is not clear at all and specifically clarifies you going to camper what vs what.

Thank you for comment. With respect, This study aimed to prepare DNA profiles from the dental samples of the volunteers and to compare the results with blood sample profiles. Please see Objective section..

Comment 4: Define the STDV in table No.1.

Corrected as instructed; In the result section, STDV was defined in the first paragraph.

Comment 5: As my conception, the manuscript is evaluating the effect of EDTA temperature on DNA extracted from the tooth, so I suggest changing the title part of the manuscript to a more descriptive, direct, and accurate one.

Corrected as instructed; the title of the manuscript was changed to: “The Effect of EDTA Buffer and Temperature on DNA Extraction from Teeth for Molecular Forensic Assessment”

Comment 6: The following explanation should be included in the introduction, along with new references and peripherally in a table: - Various methods of DNA Extrction from Teeth.

Thank you for your constructive comment. Corrected as instructed; the references have been updated and some new references have been added, please see [2-6], [8,9], [11-25] and Introduction section.

Reviewer 2:

Please check the mentioned items.

Comment 1: The number of references is lower than for an original article.

Thank you, corrected as instructed. the references have been updated and some new references have been added, please see [2-6], [8,9], [11-25], and [29].

Comment 2: Limit the word count of the abstract to about 250 words for the original article.

Corrected as instructed. The number of words in the abstract section was reduced to less than 250 words.

Comment 3: Replace the title of Section 5 to the discussion and Section 6 add as a conclusion part.

Corrected as instructed.

Associate Editor’s Comments:

EIC Comments:

Comment 1: The number of references and word count of the text is lower than for an original article. add more references and edit text (especially discusion) for the original article OR change the manuscript for short communication limit the word count of the abstract to about 250 words for the original article.

Corrected as instructed; the references have been updated and some new references have been added, please see [2-6], [8,9], [11-25], and [29]. Also, the number of words in the abstract section was reduced to less than 250 words. And edit text in Introduction, Objctive, Methode and Discussion parts. Please see Introduction, paragraph 1 in Objective, paragraph 1,3,4 in Method and paragraph 4,5 in Discussion sections.

Comment 2: Make changes in the attachment file.

Corrected as instructed; Changes were made to the attached file.

Comment 3: Also include the comments of reviewers in it.

Corrected as instructed.

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.

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 Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah,
Editor-in-Chief
Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research Journal

My co-authors and I would like to thank you for your consideration and for the constructive comments of the EIC, AE and Reviewers. We believe that it was a great educational opportunity to read your valuable comments. We have revised the paper, based on the comments, making it more complete by adding features to the previous version.

Corresponding Author

EIC Comments:

Comment 1:

The list of authors in the current revision is different from Revision 0.

Answer :

Thank you. Corrected as instructed.

Comment 2:

Figures 1-3 are not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention Figures 1-3 in the text consecutively.

Answer:

Corrected as instructed.

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (2) 23 May 2021

Dear Authors,
your manuscript was accepted. But, you must edit references. The reference number in the text and in the references section has not been matched (for example reference 24 must be Tilotta but it is 26,.....). Please recheck all references in the text and References section and match them. upload the figures too.
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 Prof. Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah,
Editor-in-Chief
Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research Journal

My co-authors and I would like to thank you for your consideration and for the constructive comments of the EIC, AE and Reviewers. We believe that it was a great educational opportunity to read your valuable comments. We have revised the paper, based on the comments, making it more complete by adding features to the previous version.

Corresponding Author

EIC Comments:

Your manuscript was accepted. But, you must edit references. The reference number in the text and in the references section has not been matched (for example reference 24 must be Tilotta but it is 26,…..). please recheck all references in the text and References section and match them. Upload the figures too.

Answer:

Thank you. Corrected as instructed.

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (3) 25 May 2021

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