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.112403
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 8(2); e112403

Peer Review Report for "In Vitro and In Silico Evaluation of Biological Activity of a New Series of Oxadiazole Compounds Against Esp Gene Expression in *Enterococcus faecalis* Biofilm"

Author(s): Sepideh Ghameshlouei, Nakisa Zarrabi Ahrabi, Yasin SarveAhrabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 5 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 10 Jan 2021

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) — 2 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The article is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

Arash Abdolmaleki: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 2 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript it is suitable but the authors should do some corrections before accepting.
1- In the abstract part, the words "Enterococcal Surface Protein" should be written in lowercase.
2- esp gene is not a good keyword please delete it.
3- In Objectives after this word "specimens" put a dot.
4- In the method part change the first sentence with this "This Research study was conducted in the microbiology laboratory of Islamic Azad University, Tehran branch, with code number: 10130553971010 in 2019"

5- In the RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis part please delete the highlight of this part "incubated at 99 °C for 5 min and inactivated."
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments, this manuscript needs minor revisions and a reply to the comments.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Jan 2021

Dear Author
Based on the reviewers' comments, this manuscript needs minor revisions and reply 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.

1- In abstract part these words "Enterococcal Surface Protein" should be written in lowercase.

A: Done.

2- esp gene is not a good keyword please delete it.

A: Done.

3- In Objectives after this word "specimens" put dot.

A: Done.

4- In method part change first sentence with this "This Research study was conducted in microbiology laboratory of Islamic Azad University, Tehran branch, with code number: 10130553971010 in 2019"

A: Done.

5- In RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis part please delete the highlight of this part "incubated at 99 °C for 5 min and inactivated."

A: Done.

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) — 5 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
I check the manuscript again and the authors did the all comment. I think that manuscript is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewer comment and as I read, revision were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewer and AE comments, revision were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.