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

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.85567
Published in: Health Scope: 9(1); e85567

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Continuous Aerobic Exercise on Nerve Growth Factor in Diabetic Rats"

Author(s): Mahnaz Omidi, Mohsen Ghanbarzadeh, Masoud Nikbakht, Abdolhamid Habibi, Rouhola Ranjbar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 27 Jan 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) 22 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- English writing is very poor and the manuscript should be edited grammatically
2- The authors have written in the method section of the abstract "…Weight range of 281±28 grams…". I think this is the mean and SD and not rage!
3- In the statistical analysis should be written as".. The data were analyzed using repeated-measures ANOVA and the pairs were compared with Bonferroni correction"
4- The random allocation should be explained completely
5- The method of analysis should be revised and corrected. It seems that there are both within groups and between groups in this study. The interactions between time and groups should be checked too. The repeated measurement ANOVA with several groups is recommended
6- The title of the tables is not according to the details in the tables. Please revise the title of the tables.
7- Why do the baseline means are different weeks? Moreover, if the baseline weight and FBS are different after 8 and 12 weeks, so these amounts should be adjusted in the final model.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The manuscript with the title “The effect of continuous aerobic exercise on neurogenesis in diabetic rats” is a well-designed and well-written work. However, needs some correction which listed below:
1. The title is general and it is better to mention the nerve growth factor in the title.
2. Subject use for human sample; so it is better to use the rats instead of the subject in the abstract.
3. Delete the Alzheimer's Disease in keywords.
4. In the methods section note the reference of diabetes induction.
5. In methods should more introduce how NGF measured; by blood? By tissue?.
6. In methods should more introduce how did you sacrifice the rats; by chloroform? By ketamine and xylazine?
7. At the end of the discussion note some limitations of the research and some research suggestions for future researches.
8. The format of all references is not according to journal format; for example, the name of the journal in some of them is in abbreviation but in some of them is in the full name.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The article with the title “The effect of continuous aerobic exercise on neurogenesis in diabetic rats” although has several useful points, needs Minor revision:
1. It is not necessary to use the statistical method several times in the abstract.
2. Part of the abstract especially conclusions should be written fluently.
3. Statistical analysis deleted in the abstract.
4. Conclusion is not correct. You have to re-write the findings. You must write the conclusion
5. Part of the Study design should be written fluently.
6. Part of the Experimental design should be written fluently.
7. Discussion, line 2: In the discussion, the value of p is not written
8. Conclusion should be re-written.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Dec 2018

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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 26 Dec 2018

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' request.

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.

12-1-2019

Dear Health Scope
I revised all the points of the Reviewer

:

Files Checking:

* Please provide below required footnotes in the main manuscript file:It was corrected

· Funding/Support: It was added

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) 20 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
I could not see the authors' response. The authors should respond to all reviewers' comments point to points.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jan 2019

Dear EIC,
I could not see the authors' response. The authors should respond to all reviewers' comments point to points.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Jan 2019

Dear author
I could not see the authors' response. You should respond to all reviewers' comments point to points.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

22-1-2018

Dear Health Scope

I revised all the points of the Reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

1. The title is general and it is better to mention the nerve growth factor in title. It was changed.
2. Subject use for human sample; so it is better to use the rats instead of subject in the abstract. Regarding text correction it was deleted.
3. Delete the Alzheimer Disease in keywords. It was deleted.
4. In methods section note the reference of diabetes induction. It was corrected.
5. In methods should more introduce how NGF measured; by blood? By tissue? It was corrected.
6. In methods should more introduce how did you sacrifice the rats; by chloroform? By ketamine and xylazine? It was corrected.
7. At the end of discussion note some limitation of research and some research suggestions for future researches. It was corrected.
8. The format of all references is not according to journal format; for example the name of journal in some of them is in abbreviation but in some of them is in full name. All of them were checked and only Source 1 was not formatted and modified

Reviewer 2:

1-English writing is very poor and the manuscript should be edited grammatically. The article was edited by an expert English translator.

2-The authors have written in the method section of abstract "…Weight range of 281±28 grams…" I think this is the mean and SD and not rage! Due to the correction and the new translation Weight range in abstract was deleted.

3-In the statistical analysis should be written as". The data were analyzed using repeated measurement ANOVA and the pairs were compared with bonferroni correction" It was corrected.

4- The random allocation should be explained completely. Due to the correction and the new translation, the random word was deleted.

5-the method of analysis should be revised and corrected. It seems that there is both within groups and between groups in this study. The interactions between time and groups should be checked too. The repeated measurement ANOVA with several groups is recommended. It was corrected.

6-the title of the tables is not according to the details in the tables. Please revise the title of tables they were corrected.

7- Why do the baseline means are different weeks? Because of our exercise protocol consisted of different weeks (4, 8 and 12 weeks) and the rats of each stage are different, the baseline means are different weeks.

Moreover, if the baseline weight and FBS are different after 8 and 12 weeks, so these amounts should be adjusted in the final model. All of the baseline weight and FBS are different after 4, 8 and 12 weeks**.** Because these variables are not part of our main variables, they are not explored in the final model

Reviewer 3:

Dear editor-in-chief

The article in title “The effect of continuous aerobic exercise on neurogenesis in diabetic rats” although has several useful points, it needs Minor revision:

1. It is not necessary to use the statistical method several times in the abstract. It was corrected.
2. Part of the abstract especially conclusions should be written fluent. It was corrected.
3. Statistical analysis deleted in abstract. It was deleted.
4. Conclusion is not correct. You have to re-write the findings. You must write the conclusion It was corrected.
5. Part of the Study design should be written fluent. It was corrected.
6. Part of the Experimental design should be written fluent. It was corrected.
7. Discussion, line 2: In the discussion, the value of p is not written .The p value was written.
8. Conclusion should be re-written It was corrected.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 1 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
All comments are done and are corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 2 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 3 Feb 2019

Dear Authors,
You have revised the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments, and it's accepted.
Thanks.