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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.104222
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(3); e104222

Peer Review Report for "Epigenetics and Genetic Changes in CHD5 and Risk of Hepatocellular Carcinoma"

Author(s): Bita Moudi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 23 May 2020
Accepted Date: 25 May 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) — 29 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I think this letter is good. I have some suggestions for the authors to make it better.
1- Considering that you have mentioned miRNA deficiency in addition to CHD5 in the text, write the title more generally.
2- The conclusion is not according to the title and it's general. So write the title more generally.
Thanks.

Azam Asemi Rad: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 May 2020

Dear AE,
Given to manuscript entitled "Epigenetics changes in CHD5 and risk of the Hepatocellular":
The subject is interesting and remarkable and the author mentioned the important points in the manuscript. The only matter is the English language of the manuscript is not sufficient. There are some grammatical errors in the entire text and also wrong spelling, for example,

the word " tumour". In my point of view, the manuscript can be accepted after minor revision.
Best Regard,

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers comments and as I read, this manuscript as a letter to the editor is interesting but minor revision and english lqnguage editing must be done.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 May 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers' and AE comments, minor revision and English language editing must be done.
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

Thanks for the kind comments regarding our manuscript. Reviewer's comments were read carefully, and requested modifications were done according to reviewers' points of view. Some changes marked by red color. We hope that this revision of manuscript could qualify it to be published in the" **GCT**".

Yours' sincerely

Bita Moudi

Dear author,
I think your letter is good. I have some suggestion to make it better.
1- Considering that you have mentioned miRNA deficiency in addition to CHD5 in the text, write the title more generally.
2- The conclusion is not according to the title and it's general. So write the title more generally.

Dear Dr. thanks for your nice comment. Now, the title is more generally.

Dear Associate editor,
Given to manuscript entitled "Epigenetics changes in CHD5 and risk of the Hepatocellular":
The subject is interesting and remarkable and the author mentioned the important points in the manuscript. The only matter is the English language of the manuscript is not sufficient. There are some grammatical errors in the entire text and also wrong spelling, for example, the word " tumour". In my point of view, the manuscript can be accepted after minor revision.
Best Regard,

Dear Dr. thanks for your nice comment. The English language of the manuscript corrected and changes marked by red color.

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) 23 May 2020

Dear AE,
The previous comment on the manuscript entitled" epigenetics changes in CHD5 and risk of the hepatocellular carcinoma" has been noted precisely by the author and the necessary changes had been performed. this edited version is suitable for publishing in Gene, cell, and tissue journal.
Best,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 24 May 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript and reviewed the sections modified by the author in response to the reviewers. I must point out that this version is suitable for accepting.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments, revisions were done well. Thus this manusript can be published as a letter to the editor in GCT.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 May 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.