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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.109990
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 7(4); e109990

Peer Review Report for "A survey on the Frequency of *Sarcocystis* in Bandar Abbas, Iran in 2019 - 2020"

Author(s): Masoud Sheikhi, Abdoreza Salahi-Moghaddam, Majid Najafi Asl, Abbas Farahani, Jebreil Shamseddin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 12 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Oct 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)

7 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled: "A survey on frequency of Sarcocystis in Bandar Abbas, Iran in 2019-2020" emphasizes an important issue from a public health point of view, although it has some drawbacks as follows:
Manuscript needs some corrections e.g. (The entire text must be reviewed and rewritten)
• ABSTRACT > METHODS > LINE 1: (cow, sheep, goat)
• ABSTRACT > RESULTS: insertion p-value
• BACKGROUND > LINE 7: pigs.[2]
• MATERIALS AND METHODS > PARAGRAPH 1: it should be: STUDY DESIGN; SAMPLE SIZE; DATE OF STUDY; STUDY AREA and RELATED and OTHER RELEVANT EXPLANATIONS
• RESULTS > PARAGRAPH 2: Most of the samples belonged to animals bred in Hormozgan province with 47.0% (n=188), Kerman province with 38.3% (n=153), Fars 13.3% (n=49), and other provinces 2.5% (n=10).
• Tables 1 and 2 should be rewritten (columns and rows)
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Oct 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,

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

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers' and AE comments this manuscript needs revisions and English language editing. The authors must revise it precisely and reply to the comments point by point.
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.

Answer to reviewer's comments

Reviewer 1

- *1. ABSTRACT > METHODS > LINE 1: (cow, sheep, goat)……. CORRECTED*
  • 2. ABSTRACT > RESULTS: insertion p-value…….. CORRECTED
  • 3. BACKGROUND > LINE 7: pigs.[2]……CORRECTED
  • 4. MATERIALS AND METHODS > PARAGRAPH 1: it should be: STUDY DESIGN; SAMPLE SIZE; DATE OF STUDY; STUDY AREA and RELATED and OTHER RELEVANT EXPLANATIONS……. CORRECTED
  •5. RESULTS > PARAGRAPH 2: Most of the samples belonged to animals bred in Hormozgan province with 47.0% (n=188), Kerman province with 38.3% (n=153), Fars 13.3% (n=49), and other provinces 2.5% (n=10). CORRECTED
  • 6. Tables 1 and 2 should be rewritten (columns and rows) CORRECTED

- **Reviewer 2**

1. Ethic statement moved to proper place
2. Grammar checked for manuscript
3. P value inserted in main text
4. type of study mentioned in proper places
5. Two newer references added.

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) 13 Oct 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) 18 Oct 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) 19 Oct 2020

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

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers and AE comments revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks