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.113112
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 9(3); e113112

Peer Review Report for "Combined First-trimester Screening of Trisomy 21 in Women of Different Ages in Southwest Iran"

Author(s): Mehran Dorostghoal, Mojgan Barati, Mojgan Harfsheno

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 30 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 6 Feb 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) 21 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
This article is appropriate for publication case of minor revision.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments on a manuscript entitled " Combined first-trimester screening of trisomy 21 in women of different age in Southwest Iran" for the GCT.
The manuscript is recommended to accept after minor revision. This manuscript assessed the performance and effectiveness of combined first-trimester screening (FTS) for DS in women of different age in Southwest Iran and demonstrates that FTS is an effective screening method for DS in women younger and older than 35 years.
There are several concerns with this manuscript. To improve the reported original research, it is better to consider the following comments:
1. The english language of the manuscript is not sufficient and English editing is highly

recommended.
2. To the best of my knowledge, plenty of work has been done in the world on the screening of pregnant women, and in connection with this research, no innovation has been made. Has it?
3. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, In addition, all abbreviations used in each table should be defined below that table.
4. Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search".
5. Use the same pattern to write the article. The author should pay attention to the main format of the journal.
6. The statistical tests used in this research should be fully introduced.
7. Several parameters have been measured in this study. The author should explain the method of measuring each in the method section. It is recommended to use photos and documentary images.
8. The discussion section has been very long. It is suggested that some information, which is mainly presented as a number, be arranged in a table.
9. The final conclusion still needs correction. The most important details of the study should be mentioned.
Kindest Regards

Azam Asemi Rad: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers' and AE's comments this manuscript needs minor revisions and replies 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.

Editor-in-Chief of Gene, Cell and Tissue

Dear Professor Dr. Heidari

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript (**113112)** entitled "**Combined first-trimester screening of trisomy 21 in women with different age in Southwest Iran**". We carefully considered the comments offered by dear reviewer. Herein, we explain how we revised the paper based on those comments and recommendations;

Reviewer 1

1. Comment: The English language of the manuscript is not sufficient and English editing is highly recommended.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have made careful modifications to the original manuscript and carefully proof-read the manuscript to minimize typographical and grammatical errors and highlighted the words in the revised manuscript.

2. Comment: As the best of my Knowledge, plenty of works have been done in the world on the screening of pregnant women, and in connection with this research, no innovation has been made. Has it?

Response: Thank you very much for this point. In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of combined FTS in women under the age of 35 and over, the present study for the first time examined the effectiveness of combined FTS in pregnant women in Southwest Iran, and also report the risk and prevalence of Down syndrome in this region.

3. Comment: All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, In addition, all abbreviations used in each table, should be defined bellow that table.

Response: Thank you very much for this point. We corrected all abbreviations in the manuscript and tables.

4. Comment: Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search".

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We checked and corrected the keywords according to MeSH Headings.

5. Comment: Use the same pattern to write the article. The author should pay attention to the main format of the journal.

Response: Thank you very much for this comment. We checked and corrected manuscript according to the format of **Gene, Cell and Tissue** journal.

6. Comment: The statistical tests used in this research should be fully introduced.

Response: Thank you very much for this point. We explained the statistical tests used to detect differences between groups in the "**Statistical analysis**" section.

7. Comment: Several parameters have been measured in this study. The author should explain the method of measuring each in the method section. It is recommended to use photos and documentary images.

Response: Thank you so much for this comment. We added some explanations and sonographic pictures in method section.

8. Comment: The discussion section has been very long. It is suggested that some information, which is mainly presented as a number, be arranged in a table.

Response: Thank you very much for suggestion. We have tried to explain all findings in detail and compare the results with other studies.

9. Comment: The final conclusion still needs correction. The most important details of the study should be mentioned.

Response: Thank you very much for this comment. We added some explanations in "**Conclusion**" section.

Best regards,

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.

Azam Asemi Rad: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 2 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Considering that this manuscript had a peer review in the previous version, I read the manuscript and reviewed the sections modified by the author in response to the reviewers. I must point out that this version is suitable for acceptance in the journal.
Sincerely,

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision (1)** 6 Feb 2021

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