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

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.85122
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(4); e85122

Peer Review Report for "Optimization of 3D Alginate Scaffold Properties with Interconnected Porosity Using Freeze-drying Method for Cartilage Tissue Engineering Application"

Author(s): Naghmeh Bahrami, Ali Farzin, Farshad Bayat, Arash Goodarzi, Majid Salehi, Roya Karimi, Abdolreza Mohamadnia , Alireza Parhiz , Jafar Ai

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 10 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 19 Dec 2018

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) 31 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
This manuscript is good and suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
The paper is entitled:
“Optimization of 3D Alginate Scaffold Properties with Interconnected Porosity using Freeze-drying Method for Cartilage Tissue Engineering Applications”
This idea in optimizing alginate scaffold alginate for cell differentiation can be novel.
This paper can be published with minor revision:
In figure 2 (c): please reveal the significant differences between groups and explain differences between degradation rate in the main text.
The whole paper needs to be double checked versus grammar and vocabulary.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

21 Nov 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

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

21 Nov 2018

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.

November 15, 2020

Dear Editor
Editor, Archive of Neuroscience

Subject: Submission of revised manuscript (ID: 85122)

We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments. We have revised the manuscript based on their comments. In addition, we have highlighted the revised sections within the manuscript. Please find the discussions below and amendments in response to the reviewers' comments.

We changed all author's name according to sequence of previous version.

We hope that you will find our manuscript suitable for publication in Archive of Neuroscience and look forward to your decision.

Response to the reviewers' comments

Reviewer # 1:

1. Reviewer: Optimization of 3D Alginate Scaffold Properties with Interconnected Porosity using Freeze-drying Method for Cartilage Tissue Engineering Applications"
This idea in optimizing alginate scaffold alginate for cell differentiation can be novel.
This paper can be published with minor revision:
In figure 2 (c): please reveal the significant differences between groups and explain differences between degradation rate in the main text.
The whole paper needs to be double checked versus grammar and vocabulary.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the comment. We add significant differences for degredation rate curve (figure 2 (c)). To address this comment, we edited the related paragraph at page 10 as follows:

"(there is significant difference between degradation rate of samples soaked in water and DMEM+FBS)."

Furthermore, we revised the WHOLE manuscript carefully to avoid language errors. In addition, we asked several colleagues who are skilled authors to check the English. We believe that the language is now acceptable.

2. Reviewer: this manuscript is good and suitable for publication.

Response: We thank the reviewer given insight into our work.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 12 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The revised manuscript is good for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2018

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Dec 2018

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