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.85715
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(2); e85715

Peer Review Report for "Multitarget Effects of Coconut Oil (Virgin Type) on Aβ-Induced Alzheimer's Disease Animal Model"

Author(s): Fatemeh Mirzaei, Mozafar Khazaei, Alireza Komaki, Iraj Amiri, Cyrus Jalili

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 2 Dec 2018
Accepted Date: 12 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: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 Nov 2018

Dear Authors,
I do not find a neurologist having worked and treated patients with Alzheimer's disease in the list of authors. Apart from that, please state the role of each author in the study.
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.

Thank so much for reviewing this manuscript.

Professor A k (the author of this manuscript) is a head of the Department of Neurology Research Center, and has done a lot of experiment related to Alzheimer. On the other hand, the corresponding author has done various experiment related to neurological disorders.

F M prepared first draft of manuscript and participated in animal handling, tissue preparation, biochemical factors analysis and gene expression. A K participated in animal handling (inducing Alzheimer), M Kh and I A did histological analysis. S J prepared manuscript and involved in all methods. All authors have read and approve final version of manuscript.

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) 25 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
This is an interesting work, but two minor corrections are needed.
1) 2.4 "method described previously": add reference.
2) 2.6 "described in a previous study": add reference.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 28 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** (1) 28 Nov 2018

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on the reviewer's comments.
Thanks.

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 Editor

Thank you for the review of our manuscript, entitled "**Multitarget Effects of Coconut Oil (Virgin Type) on Aβ-Induced Alzheimer's Disease Animal Model**" that was submitted to your valid journal .

We greatly appreciate your efforts and your helpful comments in reviewing our article.

Dear reviewers

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We corrected the manuscript according to the comments. We hope that the revised article is improved now at a level of your satisfaction.

Reviewer #1:
Comments:

This is an interesting work, but two minor corrections are needed.

1) 2.4 "method described previously": add reference .Was corrected
2) 2.6 "described in a previous study": add reference" .Was corrected

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 6 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
In this form the work is right: accept.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 12 Dec 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 12 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.