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.89702
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 6(1); e89702

Peer Review Report for "Preeclampsia or Placenta Previa; Extravillous Trophoblast Cells Are Determinative"

Author(s): Nadia Sheibak

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Jan 2019
Revised Date: 3 Feb 2019
Accepted Date: 3 Feb 2019

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) — 1 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Generally, the topic of the paper is an important issue in pregnancy-related diseases which made the review interesting. The article finally offers a hypothesis that can progress our understanding of these diseases, however, further investigations and studies are required for a definite conclusion.
Comments in the word file should be checked for a better explanation of the subjects like giving examples for angiogenesis-related factors and mediators of inflammation and correction of some writing mistakes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
In my opinion, the article has Reasonable content as well as grammatical issues and ready for acceptance entering.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Feb 2019

Dear AE<

I as a reviewer did read your work, fantastic and somehow charming me. I propose a bit more attention to grammatical issues. for example

- Internal os instead of internal OS (paragraph 2)
- Placenta in the lower segment of the uterus, instead of the placenta in the lower segment of the uterine. (paragraph 3), test this hypothesis instead of exam this hypothesis (last paragraph).

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 3 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should check the manuscript for some minor corrections.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Feb 2019

Dea Author,
This manuscript is interesting, based on reviewers and AE comments need minor revision.
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.

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your letter with regard to my manuscript entitled: "**Preeclampsia or placenta previa; extravillous trophoblast cells are determinative – ID: 89702**".

I greatly appreciate for your time in editing my manuscript and the valuable comments and suggestions from reviewers. Accordingly, I have revised the manuscript in track changes mode in MS word. The point-by-point answers to the comments are listed as below. Revised file with yellow highlights was resubmitted to the Gene, cell and tissue journal.

Thank you once again for considering of my manuscript. Should there be any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With Kind regards,

Yours Sincerely,

Nadia Sheibak

>>> REVIEWER No. 3 <<<

1-Second paragraph: done.

2-Third paragraph: done.

3-Last paragraph: 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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 3 Feb 2019

Dear Authors,
You revised the manuscript well. Thus it can be accepted for publication in GCT.
Thanks.