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.98377
Published in: Gene, Cell and Tissue: 6(4); e98377

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Training, Hyaluronic Acid, and Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapies on Osteocalcin Gene Expression in Cartilage Tissue of Rats with Knee Osteoarthritis"

Author(s): Marjan Haghjoo, Mohammad Ali Azarbayjani, Maghsoud Peeri, Seyed Ali Hosseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 9 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 13 Nov 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) 30 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript is well written. There are some suggestions to make it better.
1- There are some grammatical or vocabulary mistakes in the text; please correct them. For example, in the following sentence:
Although many studies have been performed on the effects of different interventions on the treatment or rehabilitation of training along with other interventions,
2- Please enter the number of cells in the abstract section correctly. 1 × 106 cells/kg (1 × 106 cells / kg)
3- It is said, "OA was surgically performed according to Zhao et al. (13)" In this study, the model of exercise-induced osteoarthritis was performed after cutting ACL and PCL ligaments, and it looks like your surgical procedure is different; please explain it.
4- Please mention the first author's name to refer to the study { Zhou et al. (13}, this person is the second author!
5- What is the internal lateral ligament? Does it mean medial collateral ligament?
6- Change the word minuscule with the meniscus.

7- Please correct the measurement unit of primer in the sampling and OC measurement section: {(primer 100 nm)?}
8- Please show a photo of extracted mRNA or cDNA on agarose gel in the result section.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 1 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
I have read the manuscript entitled “Effect of Training, Hyaluronic Acid, and Mesenchymal Stem Cells Therapies on Osteocalcin Gene Expression in the Cartilage Tissue of Rats with Knee Osteoarthritis.” The authors concluded that a combination of ET, HA, and MSC, compared to implementing each one alone has a favorable effect on the improvement of OC in the cartilage tissue of rats with knee OA.
The English language of the manuscript is sufficient also I have some concerns about this manuscript and there are some points that should be revised and/or commented on. In my opinion, it is better the authors follow the below points.
1. In the abstract, the method is not sufficient. Gene expression technique is not mentioned.
2. In methods, the author must explain more about RNA extraction, cDNA synthesis, and real-time methods completely.
3. Introduced method was used to report the final results of the real time?
Final decision: major revision.
Kindest Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 5 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The article is recommended for minor revision. However, I have several concerns about this manuscript and there are many points that should be revised and/or commented on:
1. Why the authors did not determine any group as a sham because mesenchymal stem cells condition media could have a protective role?
2. Did the authors have any method to confirm the disease model?
3. The authors did not mention the version of SPSS that they use.
4. Why authors did not add the figure of gene expression in the text?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 5 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Based on the reviewers' comments, this manuscript needs major revisions and precise point-by-point answers.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 5 Oct 2019

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

precise point-by-point answers.

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-in-Chief

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title **”The Effect of Training, Hyaluronic Acid and Mesenchymal Stem Cells Therapies on** Osteocalcin Gene Expression **in the Cartilage Tissue of Rats with Knee Osteoarthritis”** first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. All grammatical and vocabulary errors in the text corrected by English speaker.
2. The number of cells corrected in the abstract section.
3. The reference for OA corrected in manuscript.
4. In all parts of article the firs author mentioned for refer to the study.
5. The word “medial collateral ligament” corrected in methods section.
6. The word meniscus corrected in all parts of manuscript.
7. The measurement unit of primer in the sampling and OC measurement section corrected.
8. A photo of extracted mRNA added to result section.

Reviewer 2

1. The manuscript edited by English speaker.
2. In abstract gene expression technique mentioned.
3. RNA extraction, CDNA synthesis, and real- time methods completely introduced in methods.

Reviewer 3

1. About comment of reviewer “Why the authors did not determine any group as a sham because mesenchymal stem cells condition media could have protective role?” as sham group is important at the end of discussion noted that sham lack of sham group in present study was research limitation and it proposed that in future study the researchers use sham group.
2. The method to confirm the disease model noted in methods section.
3. The version of SPSS noted in methods section.
4. Figure of gene expression presented in results section.

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) — 12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The author has made the requested changes. Thus this manuscript is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 13 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The author has made the requested changes, and the article is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 13 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The author has made the reforms and the manuscript can be accepted in its current version.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers' comments, revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in Gene, Cell, and Tissue journal.
Thanks.

Zahra Heidari: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 Nov 2019

Dear Authors,
Based on the reviewers' and AE's comments, revisions were done well. Thus this manuscript can be accepted for publication in Gene, Cell, and Tissue journal.
Thanks.