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

Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/jcrps.102497
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 9(2); e102497

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Nandrolone Treatment with And Without Resistance Training on Superoxide Dismutase Concentration and Pathology of Kidney Tissue in Rats"

Author(s): Esfandiyar Heidari, Seyed Ali Hosseini, Mohammad Ali Azarbayjani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 11 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Sep 2020

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 May 2020

Dear AE,
1. There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
2. Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.
3. In the background, it is necessary to mention complete word for the first time not abbreviation like TNF-α, IL-1b…
4. In the section of the discussion need for real reasons for interpreting the research finding.
5. In conclusion it is common to mention our direct finding not to suggest an administration directly.
6. Some references format needs to be corrected according to the style used.
(DOI &…)
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
• Report the link of keywords in Mesh.

• Introduction is well written and acceptable.
• Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be reported in methods.
• Report the mean weight of rats.
• All P- value reported by Caps luck P not with p.

• References should be basically revised and adjusted according to the format of the journal. It is recommended for references to be compatible with Mendelian or Endnote.
• The author should report the Ethics code.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 7 Sep 2020

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**)** 7 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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 of Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences

Thank you so much for informing us of the review result of the manuscript submitted to your journal. We would also like to appreciate the valuable, meticulous and insightful comments offered by dear reviewers. I would like to announce that the amendments requested by the esteemed judges were applied in the text and the relevant changes are shown in red, which are listed as follows.

Thank you again for your kind attention.

Best regards,

Dr. Syed Ali Hossieni

Reviewer 1:

1. There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

Corrections were made in the text.

2. Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction.

Although anabolic steroids are prescribed and used for the treatment of some diseases, abuse of anabolic steroids can lead to acute injury, chronic injury and glomerular toxicity in various parts of kidney.These studies show that the abuse of anabolic steroids by the mechanism of activation of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone system through activation ofendothelin and development of free radicals increase the expression of pre-fibrotic and pre-apoptotic proteins, and increase inflammatory cytokines (TNF-α, IL-1b and IL-6). Anabolic steroids also cause changes in the size, glomerular filtration ratio, and changes in the function of the tubules in these individuals (2).On the otherhand, nandrolone(N) administration for 6, 8, 12 and 24 months in the treatment of certain diseases in men and women with AIDS had beneficial effects on fat loss and improving immune function

A study showed that the use of stanozolol increased oxidative stress in renal vascular endothelial tissue and decreased glomerular filtration function (8).Also, in another study, resistance training (RT) + Nconsumption decreased catalase activity and increased glutathione peroxidase activity in cardiac tissue compared to the N consumption control (C) group

3. In the section of discussion need to really reasons for interpret research finding.

Corrections were made in the text.

4. In conclusion it is common to mention our direct finding not to suggest an administration directly.

Corrections were made in the text.

5. Some references format needs to be corrected according to the style used.

(DOI &…)

DOI: 10.1186/s12882- 019-1384-0

. DOI: 10.1001/archinte.165.5.578

DOI: 10.1001/jama.281.14.1275

DOI:10.1053/j.jrn.2007.01.001

DOI:10.1159/00103000

DOI:10.1016/j.toxlet.2017.10.015

Doi: 10.1016/j.jsbmb.2013.06.006

Persian

Persian

DOI: 10.1016/j.lfs.2019.117227

DOI: 10.1016/j.aanat.2019.05.003

DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0102699

DOI: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2014.05.010

DOI: 10.1016/j.fct.2012.07.006

DOI: 10.1038/ki.2013.230

DOI: 10.1016/j.ekir.2019.04.001

Reviewer 2

• Report the link of keywords in Mesh.

Corrections were made in the text.

• Introduction is well written and acceptable.

• Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be reported in methods.

Corrections were made in the text.

• Report the mean weight of rats.

Corrections were made in the text.

• All P- value reported by Caps luck P not with p.

Corrections were made in the text.

• References should be basically revised and adjusted according to the format of the journal. It is recommended for references to be compatible with Mendelian or Endnote.

Corrections were made in the text.

• The author should report the Ethics code

Ethical Approval: This article comes from a Ph.D thesis of Sport Physiology. It has been registered with code IR.SSRC.REC.1398.002 at ethics committee of Institute of physical education of Ministry of science' Research and Technology.

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 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
All comments are made by the authors.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The author has corrected the comments correctly, please give the manuscript a certificate of acceptance.
Thanks,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 16 Sep 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Nasrollah Sohrabi: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 16 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.