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.99131
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(1); e99131

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Endurance Training with Saffron Consumption on PGC1-α Gene Expression in Hippocampus Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer's Disease"

Author(s): Fatemeh Azarian, Sirous Farsi, Seyed Ali Hosseini, Mohammad Ali Azarbayjani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 5 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Feb 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)

12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript evaluates the effects of endurance training and saffron consumption on the expression of PGC-1α gene in the hippocampus tissue of rats with Alzheimer's disease. The manuscript has fair novelty because the effects of training and saffron have been separately determined in other investigations (see the background of the manuscript). However, the major concern is the effect of endurance training on the expression of PGC-1α gene. The exercise results in rapid increases in expression of PGC-1α (see "Exercise-induced Mitochondrial Biogenesis Begins before the Increase in Muscle PGC-1 Expression, 2007, Journal of Biological Chemistry, 282 (1): 194-9"). However, as depicted in figure 1, endurance training causes a reduction in PGC-1α expression! Moreover, no significant difference was found between "saffron+endurance training" and "saffron" groups. On the other hand, it seems that there is no synergistic activity between these treatments (saffron consumption and endurance training). Other minor requirements include grammatical errors in the text, no informative figure legend, no-defined statistical level in the figure.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Sayid Mahdi Mirghazanfari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
Abstract:
- The "PGC1-α gene" should be briefly defined (it's role).
- The method of Alzheimer's Disease induction had to indicated briefly instead of some unnecessary data. And the increasing or decreasing role of Alzheimer's induction on PGC1-α gene expression must be mentioned.
Methods:
- It's better to use the term "animals" instead of "specimens"; preparing the aqueous extract and extracting the hippocampal tissues should be discussed in different paragraphs; the sentence "… to evaluate the effect of trimethylethylene and saffron (normal saline) on Alzheimer's induction and to calculate …" is wrong.
Results:
- There is no need to repeat the name of statistical software, tests, and post-test.
- The raw results from SPSS had not to be presented, only the chief data of each group and differences between them (by symbols) must be shown in one table.
- In figure 1: The definition and scale of the axis "Y" must be determined; the SEM or SD bars for mean must be added to the diagram; the significance data must be shown with the symbol "*" and it should be mentioned that between which groups there is a significant difference; the subtitles of diagrams must be completed; The abbreviation should be defined.
Discussion:
- The text from the beginning of a discussion to sentence " …and increased oxidative stress (21,22)." Or the sentences " No study has investigated the effect…" or " Nowadays saffron has been introduced…" are suitable for introduction not for discussion. The discussion should only relate the results of the study and comparing them with similar studies and the probable mechanisms of effects.
Thanks.

Sayid Mahdi Mirghazanfari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 2019

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,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Dec 2019

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

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title ”**Effect of Endurance Training with Saffron Consumption on PGC1-α Gene Expression in the Hippocampus Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer's Disease**” first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. All grammatical errors in all part of the text corrected by English editor.
2. Figure legend and the statistical level defined in the figure 1.

Reviewer 2

1. In abstract the "PGC1-α gene" briefly defined.
2. In abstract the method of Alzheimer's Disease induced.
3. In abstract the results of Alzheimer's induction on PGC1-α gene expression noted.
4. The term "animals" used in all parts of methods instead of "specimens".
5. The methods for preparing the aqueous extract of saffron noted.
6. The methods for preparing the extracting the hippocampal tissues noted.
7. Sentences about the statistical analysis corrected as reviewer noted.
8. Results section corrected as reviewer noted.
9. Figure 1 corrected according to suggestions of reviewer.
10. Unnecessary sentences in discussion deleted and just related studies as well as probable mechanisms of effects introduced.

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Feb 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.