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.111097
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 8(2); e111097

Peer Review Report for "The Roles of Aerobic Training and Ozone Therapy Concerning Osteoarthritis and Cardiovascular Disease"

Author(s): Atousa Zandi, Hasan Matinhomaee, Lida Moradi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 12 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 22 Dec 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Nadia Sheibak: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 14 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
With respect to the authors, the article is recommended to reject, due to lack of novelty.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
The authors studied The clinical approach of physical activity and ozone therapy concerning osteoarthritis. They found that ozone injections relieve knee pain and improve the quality of life of people with osteoarthritis of the knee. The study looks fine and could be accepted in the current version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
In the letter to the editor entitled “The clinical approach of physical activity and ozone therapy concerning osteoarthritis” the author/s described how ozone therapy can promote

healing in the patients suffering from osteoarthritis. There are some concerns that need to be addressed by the authors before possible publication in your journal.
1- I recommend that the manuscript be edited by a professional English-speaking writer. There are several grammatical and structural mistakes in the article.
2- As obvious in the title, the author aimed to endorse the combination therapy using physical activity and ozone therapy for patients with osteoarthritis. However, they did not mention anything about physical activity as a part of this therapeutic approach.
Thanks.

Azam Asemi Rad: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 20 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the manuscript entitled" The clinical approach of physical activity and ozone therapy concerning osteoarthritis". The review process is now complete, and all thorough reviews are included. The reviewers found considerable concerns like lack of information about the physical activity. The manuscript also needs English editing. please document and highlight the revising parts.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 21 Nov 2020

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers and AE comments this manuscript needs major revisions and English language editing. The authors must revise it precisely and also 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.

Responses to reviews

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear editor

In the letter to editor entitled "The clinical approach of physical activity and ozone therapy concerning osteoarthritis" the author/s described how ozone therapy can promote healing in the patients suffering from osteoarthritis. There are some concerns than need to be addressed before possible publication in your journal.

1- I recommend that the manuscript be edited by a professional English-speaking writer. There are several grammatical and structural mistakes in the article.

Response: The manuscript was edited again by the English editor and the certificate was sent to the journal editor.

2- As obvious in the title, the author aimed to endorse the combination therapy using physical activity and ozone therapy for patients with osteoarthritis. However, they did not mention anything about physical activity as a part of this therapeutic approach.

Response: Thanks for you. The title and body of the manuscript were edited.

Reviewer 2:

Dear editor,

The authors studied The clinical approach of physical activity and ozone therapy concerning osteoarthritis. They found that ozone injections relieve knee pain and improve the quality of life of people with osteoarthritis of the knee. The study looks fine and could be accepted in the current version.

Response: Thanks for you.

Reviewer 3:

Final evaluation:

With respect to the authors, the article is recommended to reject, due to lack of novelty.

Response: This article presents a fascinating for readers. We try to improve its quality and added something regarding cardiovascular effects.

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) 20 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The response to the comment is appropriate and can be accepted and published in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
This version of the edited manuscript is suitable for acceptance and publication.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
Revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.