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

Gene, Cell and Tissue
Article DOI: 10.5812/gct.110381
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 8(2); e110381

Peer Review Report for "The Expression of *Wnt5a* Gene Throughout Definitive Endoderm Induction Process in Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells"

Author(s): Shahrokh Lorzadeh, Negar Azarpira, Saeid Ghavami, Leila Kohan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 26 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 28 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.

Mahdiyeh Haratisadegh: Reviewer | Revision (0) 20 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Please describe the significance in the graphs.
- Line 44 small grammatical problem. Please correct this sentence as follows; " β-catenin plays the central role, which is under constant degradation by a destructive complex.
- Line 46 please remove "the" in By the induction of canonical wnt signaling.
- Line 51 changes "od" to "on ", independent of β-catenin.
- Line 54 please remove the redundant sentence; "Canonical wnt signaling is responsible for cell hemostasis and proliferation".
- Line 75. Please remove the DOI number and add it to the citations in the following sentence; "suspension culture method [10.1634/stemcells.2004-0262]".
- Line 92. Please correct the word "in order".
Thanks.

Saeedeh Salimi: Reviewer | Revision (0) 20 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The current manuscript is a well-written manuscript with a novel finding. Therefore it is

suitable for publication. The authors should correct only two items as below:
- Line 18, the “modification of ATG5 gene expression” is not obvious.
- Please correct the title of the Y-axis of figure 1
Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
1- Keywords should be presented based on the MeSH terms.
2- It seems that the sentence "Graphical representations were
107 depicted by Microsoft Excel 2019 and GraphPad prism (version 8)" is unnecessary in the statistical analysis section.
3- It is better to shoes the significant results in the graphs with symbols such as stars.
Thanks.

Saeedeh Salimi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Oct 2020

Dear EIC
The manuscript is suitable for publication
Best

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers comments this manuscript needs minor revisions. the author must revised it and reply point by point to the comments.
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

We are very grateful for the valuable comments of reviewers and you. There are the answers to comments as bellow:

Reviewer 1:

Please describe the significancy in the graphs.
The significancy was marked by star sign in figures.

Line 44 small grammatical problem. Please correct this sentence as follows; " β-catenin plays the central role, which is under constant degradation by a destructive complex.
Line 46 remove "the" in By the induction of canonical wnt signaling.
Line 51 change "od" to "on ", independent od β-catenin.
Line 54 please remove the redundant sentence; "Canonical wnt signaling is responsible for cell hemostasis and proliferation".
Line 75. Please remove the DOI number and add it to the citations in the following sentence; "suspension culture method [10.1634/stemcells.2004-0262]".
Line 92. Please correct the word "in order".
The grammatical errors was corrected.

Reviewer 2:
1- keywords should be presented based on the MeSH terms.
The keywords was corrected according to your suggestion.

2- It seems that the sentence "Graphical representations were 107 depicted by Microsoft Excel 2019 and GraphPad prism (version 8)" is unnecessary in the statistical analysis section.
The sentence was deleted.

3- It is better to shoes the significant results in the graphs by symbols such as stars.
The significant result was shown by star according to your suggestion.

Reviewer 3:
Dear editor
The current manuscript is a well-written manuscript with a novel finding. Therefore it is suitable for publication. The authors should correct only two items as bellow:

-Line 18, the "modification of ATG5 gene expression" is not obvious.
The error was deleted.

-Please correct the title of Y-axis of figure 1.

The title was corrected.

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) 28 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have corrected the manuscript according to the reviewers' comments.
Best regards

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Oct 2020

Dear Author,
Based on the AE comment revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.