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.113497
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: In Press(In Press); e113497

Peer Review Report for "Simultaneous Effect of Resistance Training and Alpha Lipoic Acid on Beclin-1 Expression and Malondialdehyde Level of Fatty Liver Diabetic Male Rats"

Author(s): Fatemeh Jafary Nia, Bahareh Yazdanparast Chaharmahali, Farah Nameni

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 21 Feb 2021
Accepted Date: 2 Mar 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) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript is suitable. I suggest the authors do alterations.
1- In the abstract or in all parts of the manuscript when you use abbreviation at first you should define it. Then use the abbreviation.
2- Edit the English of the manuscript you used some words that are not academic words. English should be checked with natives.
3- Give section to the material and method part and result in part.
4- You said that you use 100 rats but you have 5 groups with 7 rats in each group?
5- About the induction of diabetes animals with fasting glucose above 200 mg is considered as a diabetic animal. Please explain why you use 126 mg as a diabetic animal.
6- Which dose of ketamine and xylazine you used? Also, correct the English of xylazine.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,

The authors investigated the effect of resistance training and alpha lipoic acid on Beclin-1 gene expression and MDA serum concentration of fatty liver diabetic male rat. The article is very poorly written and must be to be largely revoked before further evaluations. I suggest using a High-Quality Language Editing service.

- The title should be changed to “Simultaneous effect of resistance training and alpha lipoic acid on Beclin-1 expression and Malondialdehyde level of fatty liver diabetic male rats”

In the Abstract:

- What does MIIT refer to? The author should not use abbreviations at first appearance. It also stands for “ALA.”
- The name of all genes, i.e., Becline-1, should be italicized throughout the manuscript.
- What do you mean by “MDA concentration was caught”?!!! Many parts of the manuscript should be reworded, and the authors are strongly encouraged to use more scientific terms.
- There is no need to mention the test used for statistical analysis.
- In the sentence “with ALA supplementation significantly reduced the variables Beclin1 and MDA compared to …” remove the word “variables” and “Be”.
- P-values of the main findings should be mentioned in the Abstract.

Introduction:

- Countless grammatical- and typo-errors are presented in the Introduction. Again, the quality of the article should be largely enhanced before acceptance.
- There is no continuity between sentences, and many sentences are inappropriately referenced. Moreover, this section should be divided into paragraphs.

Objective:

- What do you mean by “Evidence are different”?! Please remove the sentence or replace it with a relevant one.
- Again, grammar and writing!

Methods:

- How the authors randomly divided rats into 5 groups (each group 7 rats) and still selected 28 rats as subjects?!!! Something does not seem to be correct!
- What do you mean by “To causing type 2 diabetes in the study sample”? Replace “To causing” by “For inducing.”

Statistical analyses

- What’s software package was used for statistical analysis? What’s the significance level?

Other parts of the manuscript:

- The name of genes is not consistently written in different parts of the paper.
- Sentences are frequently incomplete or very short.
- Discussion is very weak in terms of both grammar and referencing. Again, the are numerous misleading sentences that are difficult for the readers to understand.
- Many of the references are outdated. Try to use few references from the last three years.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Feb 2021

Dear AE,

The present article is unqualified for publication in this journal for the following reasons:

1- Poor writing style and observance of academic principles in it.

2- Lack of reference to the content mentioned in the materials and methods section.

3- Not to mention information such as primer sequences, etc. in the study of the RT-PCR method.
4- Problems in the statistical analysis section in terms of introducing the type of software and applied tests.
5- Not referring to the method of analyzing gene expression.
Thanks.

Saeedeh Salimi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is an animal study on the effect of Resistance Training and Alpha Lipoic Acid on the expression of Beclin-1 Gene as well as MDA Serum Concentration of Fatty Liver Diabetic Male Rat.
Although it presents new findings, it suffers from serious problems. The current manuscript is very poorly written with grammar- and typo errors. Therefore after the correction of the manuscript according to comments, the authors should largely revise before further consideration.
Best

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
Based on the reviewers' and AE's comments this manuscript needs major revisions, 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.

Greetings and courtesy

Reviewer 1:
Manuscript is suitable. I suggest the authors to do alterations.
1- In the abstract or in the all parts of the manuscript when you use abbreviation at first you should to define it. Then use the abbreviation .

All words that were in the form of abbreviations were corrected

2- Edit the English of the manuscript you used some words that is not academic word. English should to be checked with native.

English was checked with native and academic word

3- Give section to the material and method part and result part.

The materials and methods part and the result part were mentioned in separate sections

4- You said that you use 100 rats but you have 5 group with 7 rats in each group?

Sorry for the negligence, the numbers related to the number of samples were corrected

5- About the induction of diabetes animals with fasting glucose above 200 mg is considered as diabetic animal. Please explain why you use 126 mg as diabetic animal.

Sorry for the neglect, the numbers related to being diabetic had a typo and were corrected

6- Which dose of ketamin and xylazin you used? Also correct the English of xylazin
The dose of ketamine and xylazine used ,was entered and the typographical error of xylazine was corrected

Reviewer 2:

The present article is unqualified for publication in this journal for the following reasons:

1- Poor writing style and observance of academic principles in it.

The writing style and observance of academic principles were revised and corrected in the text

2- Lack of reference to the content mentioned in the materials and methods section.

Provide references to the content mentioned in the Materials and Methods section.

3- Not to mention information such as primer sequences, etc. in the study of the RT-PCR method.

In the RT-PCR method section, primer sequence information and so on were deleted

4- Problems in the statistical analysis section in terms of introducing the type of software and applied tests.

Software type testing and software added

5- Not referring to the method of analyzing gene expression.

reference gene was provided for the analysis method

Reviewer 3:
The authors investigated the effect of resistance training and alpha lipoic acid on Beclin-1 gene expression and MDA serum concentration of fatty liver diabetic male rat. The article is very poorly written and must be to be largely revoked before further evaluations. I suggest using a High-Quality Language Editing service.

Article writing reviewed. A better service was used to edit the language with better quality.
- The title should be changed to "Simultaneous effect of resistance training and alpha lipoic acid on Beclin-1 expression and Malondialdehyde level of fatty liver diabetic male rats"

The title changed to "Simultaneous effect of resistance and alpha lipoic acid on Beclin-1 expression and malondialdehyde levels in fatty liver diabetic male rats".

In the Abstract:
- What does MIIT refer to? The author should not use abbreviations at first appearance. It also stands for "ALA."

MIIT was removed. The use of abbreviations was removed and the words were completely changed

- The name of all genes, i.e., Becline-1, should be italicized throughout the manuscript.

The names of all genes throughout the manuscript became italic

- What do you mean by "MDA concentration was caught"?!!! Many parts of the manuscript should be reworded, and the authors are strongly encouraged to use more scientific terms.

MDA concentration was caught: MDA concentration was corrected

Many parts of the manuscript arranged, and the authors used more scientific terms

- There is no need to mention the test used for statistical analysis.

The test sections used for statistical analysis were reviewed
- In the sentence "with ALA supplementation significantly reduced the variables Beclin1 and MDA compared to ..." remove the word "variables" and "Be".

Removed the word "variables" and "Be

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) — 28 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The article is well-revised. Still, several typos and grammatical errors exist in the manuscript. The authors should provide an English editing certificate before acceptance.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised well. but, several typos and grammatical errors have remained in the text. The authors should edit the manuscript with an expert person.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 Mar 2021

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