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.94205
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(3); e94205

Peer Review Report for "The Role of Osteopontin in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Seyed Vahid Mousavi, Elmira Agah, Abbas Tafakhori

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 May 2019
Revised Date: 14 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Mar 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Dec 2019

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) 25 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.

Authors' response letter

Dear Dr. Zahid Hussain Khan,

It is with excitement that I resubmit to you a revised version of manuscript ID: 94205, "**The Role of Osteopontin in Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis: A Systematic Review**", to Archives of Neuroscience. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. I would like to thank the reviewer for these valuable comments. I have incorporated the suggested changes into the manuscript to the best of my ability. The manuscript has certainly benefited from these insightful revision suggestions. I look forward to working with you and the reviewers to move this manuscript closer to publication. I have responded specifically to each suggestion below and in the highlighted manuscript file, and I have numbered them as was done by the reviewer.

Thank you for your kind considerations.

Sincerely yours,

Reviewer comments:

1.Context

Please cite more recent references regarding the role of inflammation in ALS such as:

1- doi: 10.1002/mus.26289. Epub 2018 Oct 15

2- https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-018-1933-9

3- https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/7070469

Response: Thanks for this comment. We updated the citations.

as there are some common pathogenic base for Frontotemporal dementia (FTD) and familial ALS, add FTD here and the potential role of OPN in it's pathogenesis.

Such as this reference:

DOI 10.3233/JAD-2011-102151

Response: Thanks for your comment. We added FTD to this sentence.

2. Search strategy

These two search terms are the same!

Respsonse: Thanks for your attention. We omitted the last one.

these search terms must be motor neuronopathy and not neuropathy to imply to MND or ALS!

Respsonse: Thanks for your comment. We revised the terms as was suggested.

3. Tables

Cite the article as: Von Neuhoff et. al. 2012

Also for other citations in this table ad other tables

Response: Thanks for this comment. We revised the tables as was suggested.

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) 21 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The authors did my comments and recommendations effective in the revised version of the manuscript so I think the revised version has the quality of publication now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Mar 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.