Gene, Cell and Tissue
Volume 9 · Issue 1 · e119544

OPEN PEER REVIEW

AURKC Gene Polymorphism (rs58264281) Associated with Idiopathic Male Infertility Risk in Northeast of Iran: A Case-Control Study

Mohammadreza Behvarz, Seyyed Ali Rahmani, Elham Siasi Torbati, Shahla Danaei Mehrabad, Maryam Bikhof Torbati

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
17 Sep 2021	31 Oct 2021	2 Nov 2021	10.5812/gct.119544

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Ali Khosrowbeygi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Ali Khosrowbeygi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Ali Khosrowbeygi, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

3 comments · 22 Sep 2021 – 9 Oct 2021

Ali Khosrowbeygi Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 22 Sep 2021

The manuscript is well written with valuable results in its field. I think it could be useful for researchers in this field. I think that paragraph #2 should come first.
The English writing should be corrected.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 9 Oct 2021

Dear Dr. Seyyed Ali Rahmani,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal to each point raised when you submit the revised manuscript.

Yours sincerely

Bita Moudi, PhD
Associate Editor
Gene, Cell and Tissue

Reviewers' comments:
Reviewer 1.
Please recalculate the OR and CI for the over-dominant model (table 1).
Please describe the limitation of the study in the discussion section.
Please explain how you confirmed the PCR test results.
It is recommended to attach a gel photo of genotyped samples.
Decision:
Major revision
Reviewer 2.
The manuscript is well written with valuable results in its field. I think it could be useful for researchers in this field.
Decision:
Minor revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Oct 2021

Based on the reviewers' comments and my reading of the manuscript, major revisions and a point-by-point response to the comments are needed.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear editor

Thank you very much for communicating the comments of reviewers to me which are invaluable to guide revision of the manuscript. We also wish to acknowledge the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into assessing our manuscript as well as for their careful and constructive revision. We have now revised the manuscript in light of reviewer's comments and tried to fully accommodate the concerns of reviewers resulting in an improved manuscript. I hope our revision has improved the manuscript to a level of their satisfaction.

I am grateful for your consideration, and I hope that you will find the current version of the manuscript suitable for publication in *Gene, Cell and Tissue*. I look forward to hearing from you and to respond to any further questions and comments you may have.

Best regards

Reviewer 1:

1. I think that paragraph #2 is better to be mentioned first.

Response: Dear reviewer, our study is on idiopathic male infertility, and according to the previous studies, it is better that male infertility explained at the first paragraph of Introduction.

2. The English writing should be corrected.

Response: was performed.

Reviewer 2:

1. Please recalculate the OR and CI for over-dominant model (table 1).

Response: out analyst colleague recalculate OR and CI for over-dominant model and approved this data's.

2. Please express the limitation of the study in discussion part.

Response: was added in the manuscript.

3. Please explain how you confirmed the PCR test results?

Response: PCR test results were approved by sanger sequencing and mentioned in the manuscript.

4. It is recommended to attach a gel photo of genotyped samples.

Response: was performed.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 20 Oct 2021 – 25 Oct 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT 20 Oct 2021

The manuscript is well revised according to the recommendations.

Ali Khosrowbeygi Reviewer — MINOR REVISION 23 Oct 2021

The manuscript is well written with valuable results in its field. I think it could be useful for researchers in this field.
The discussion section should begin with the most important findings of the current study. I think that paragraph #2 should come first.
After the authors implement this suggestion, the manuscript could be accepted.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 25 Oct 2021

Dear Dr. Seyyed Ali Rahmani,

It is our pleasure to inform you that the mentioned article has been accepted for publication in the journal. Below you can find final comments by our peer reviewers.
Final Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
The manuscript is well written with valuable results in its field. I think it could be useful for researchers in this field.
Decision: Accept
Reviewer 2:
The manuscript is well revised according to the recommendations.
Decision: Accept
Yours sincerely

Bita Moudi, PhD
Associate Editor
Gene, Cell and Tissue

Editor-in-Chief — MINOR REVISION 25 Oct 2021

Based on the reviewer's comments and my reading, I see that revisions were made. But this manuscript still needs minor revision. Please revise it and reply to the comments.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer 1:

The discussion section should be beginning with the most important findings of the current study. I think that paragraph #2 is better to be mentioned first. After doing this suggestion by the authors, the manuscript could be accepted.

Response: Was performed. The authors thank you for your kind attention.

Reviewer 2:

The manuscript is well revised according to the recommendations.

Response: The authors thank you for your kind attention.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 1 Nov 2021 – 2 Nov 2021

Ali Khosrowbeygi Reviewer — ACCEPT 1 Nov 2021

No comments.

Associate Editor — ACCEPT 2 Nov 2021

Dear Dr. Seyyed Ali Rahmani,

It is our pleasure to inform you that the mentioned article has been accepted for publication in the journal. Below you can find final comments by our peer reviewers.
Final Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
No comments
Decision: Accept

Yours sincerely

Bita Moudi, PhD
Associate Editor
Gene, Cell and Tissue

Editor-in-Chief — ACCEPT 2 Nov 2021

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