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.99771
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(2); e99771

Peer Review Report for "Primary Spinal Cord Neurons Better Attach to Non-Coated Surfaces Than to Poly(D-lysine)-Coated Surfaces"

Author(s): Fateme Azizi, Rasoul Ghasemi, Mahmoudreza Hadjighassem

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 16 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 25 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) — 4 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
There is a manuscript with a Simple writing that can be replaced with academic writing:
- The resolution of the figure should be changed.
- Is there the same magnification between figure 1& 2?
- In addition of adhesion pictures, it's better to do a SEM microscopy to show cell morphology and attachment. it's better to do cell counting to compare two groups.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 7 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript titled "What kind of plates suitable for neonatal spinal cord-obtained neurons culture?"
The manuscript is interesting but needs some minor revision:
1- the authors found that spinal cord cells better attached to polystyrene (without coating) and grew well. As they reported this and the manuscript type is a brief report, I think using a question sentence in the title of the manuscript is suit for a review article instead of a brief report. Please use a better title for your brief report.

2- The manuscript needs an English edit.
3- Please add reference at the end of first sentence of background section.
4- Please select all keywords from MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html).
5- background and objective are very short. Please add in background 1-2 sentences about "What we know", “What we don’t know”.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2020

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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Jan 2020

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.

Response to Review Comments

(Manuscript ID: 99771)

Dear Editors,

We would like to thank the reviewer for a careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. I hope my revision has improved the paper to a level of satisfaction. Answers to each specific comments/suggestions/queries are as follows.

Response to Reviewer #1 Comments

Comment 1: There is a manuscript with a Simple writing that can be replaced with academic writing.

Response: In the revised version, the text was edited by a native English editor.

Comment 2: the figures resolution should be changed.

Response: We tried to replace current figures with higher ones (picture 2 file). However, the original files of figures are sent to the editorial office (picture 1 file).

Comment 3: is there a same between figure 1& 2?

Response: There is no similarity between figure 1& 2. These figures are from two different days (day 3 with magnifications $_x$4 and day 7 with magnifications $_x$10).

Comment 4: in addition of adhesion pictures, it's better to do a SEM microscopy to show cells morphology and attachment. it's better to do cell counting to compare two groups.

Response: The authors are grateful to the reviewer for his/her positive and encouraging comments. Given that the results were so obvious which we believed it did not quantitate them. Additionally, as this study was conducted sometimes ago, we had not opportunity to repeat it both for cell counting and SEM.

Response to Reviewer #2 Comments

Comment 1: You found that spinal cord cells better attached to polystyrene (without coating) and grew well. As your reported this and the manuscript type is a brief report, i think using a question sentence in title of manuscript is suit for a review article instead of a brief report. Please use a better title for your brief report.

Response: Thanks for the reviewers' constructive comment. As suggested, in the revised version, the title was changed.

Comment 2: The manuscript needs an English edit.

Response: In the revised version, the text was edited by a native English editor.

Comment 3: Please add reference at the end of first sentence of background section.

Response: In the revised version, reference was added at the end of the first sentence of the background section.

Comment 4: Please select all key words from MESH (http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/MBrowser.html)

Response: Thank you. We found your comments extremely helpful and have revised accordingly.

Comment 5: background and objective is very short. Please add in background 1-2 sentences about "What we know", "What we don't know".

Response: As suggested, this section revised and some more sentences added to clear up the rational of the work. (the revised paragraph is highlighted in the text).

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) 24 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 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.