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.106920
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(4); e106920

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Aerobic Training and Ozone Therapy on the Levels of *MFN1* and *DRP1* Gene Expression in the Heart Tissue of Rats with Osteoarthritis"

Author(s): Atousa Zandi, Mohammad Ali Azarbayjani, Maghsoud Peeri, Seyed Ali Hosseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 3 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Aug 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) — 8 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
It is a very interesting and relevant manuscript. The manuscript is good written but, English edit is still necessary.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- There is no information about the effect of Mfn1 and Drp1 genes expression on osteoarthritis in the manuscript.
2- Some P-value inputs should be correct (for example P-value >0.05 in the abstract).

3- Some references were missed in the text (for example, line 34).
4- Please recheck the sentence "Studies have shown that the use of ozone therapy has improved inflammatory factors and reduced pain levels in patients with knee osteoarthritis (8)".
5- The aim of the study should be mentioned in the last sentence of the introduction.
6- The material and methods section was missed in the text. The Statistical analysis should be a sub-section of this section.
7- In the abstract, the number of animals was mentioned 24, however, in the methods section that's were mentioned 30.
8- Please, explain the method used for real-time PCR data analysis.
9- Please, add the reference article that primers were used.
10- Some data such as annealing temperature, gene accession number and PCR product length must be added to table 1.
11- Recheck the sequences of the primers.
12- The control group should be renamed to the osteoarthritis control group entire the text and figures.
13- The name genes should be written in the capital and italic format.
Minor point
The text should be revised in terms of grammatical and style of writing.
Thanks.

Saeedeh Salimi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the comments of reviewers, the manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 11 Jul 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers' and AE comments this manuscript needs major revision and English language editing.
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

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title "The effect of aerobic training and ozone therapy on the levels of MFN1 and DRP1 gene expression in the heart tissue of rats with osteoarthritis" first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. Information about the effect of Mfn1 and Drp1 genes expression on osteoarthritis noted in introduction.
2. All P-value inputs corrected in abstract and results of manuscript.
3. All references corrected inside the text.
4. As reviewer noted the sentence "Studies have shown that the use of ozone therapy has improved inflammatory factors and reduced pain levels in patients with knee osteoarthritis (8)"; corrected.
5. Aim of the study mentioned in the last sentence of the introduction.
6. The material and methods section corrected.
7. The Statistical analysis noted as a sub-section
8. About the comment of reviewer "In the abstract, the number of animals was mentioned 24, however, in the methods section that's were mentioned 30" in abstract noted that 24 rats were osteoarthritis rats and 6 rats were healthy rat.
9. The method used for real-time PCR data analysis introduced.
10. About the comment of reviewer "Please, add the reference article that primers were used." It should be noted than in text of manuscript noted that primers designed by software.
11. All data such as annealing temperature, gene accession number and PCR product length added to table 1.
12. The sequences of the primers corrected.
13. The control group renamed to the osteoarthritis control group entire the text and figures.
14. In all parts of manuscript the name genes written in the capital and italic format.
15. All grammatical errors corrected by English editor.

Reviewer 2

1. All grammatical errors corrected by English editor.

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.

Saeedeh Salimi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 30 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have corrected the manuscript according to the comments of reviewers, but the primers of GAPDH should be corrected.
Best regards

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision (1)** 1 Aug 2020

Dear Authors,
Revisions were done well. But based on the reviewers' comments, still it needs minor revision for publication in GCT.
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-in-Chief

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title "The effect of aerobic training and ozone therapy on the levels of MFN1 and DRP1 gene expression in the heart tissue of rats with osteoarthritis" first, reform of reviewer was respected in the article by red color and it listed below.

Reviewer 1
The primers of GAPDH 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 3 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been corrected
Best regards

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (2) 5 Aug 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.