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.90906
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 9(2); e90906

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Training (Aerobic and concurrent) and Cinnamon Supplementation on the Plasma Levels of Visfatin and Adiponectin in Overweight Diabetic Men"

Author(s): Mehdi Baigzadeh, Sedigeh Hossienpour Delavar, Hassan Safikhani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 22 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 5 Apr 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) — 9 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
The article is good and doesn't have any problem. This article is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
The paper title needs editing.
- The keywords are incorrect. Write based on the mesh method.
- Add Cinnamon to keywords.
- Please write a reference to training.
- Please write the company and country of the laboratory kit.
- Writing results are not desirable at all. Describe tables and charts.
- References are incorrectly written.
- Pepper has many shortcomings, and poorly written.

Thanks.

Abdolhossein Taheri Kalani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
It's a good study, but it needs to be content and structural revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

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

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor 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.

The responses to dome comment that must be explained to referee

the protocol of training were is explained in materials. The respected referee had -1
.asked it in the introduction section
in the section of materials, the respected referee had asked about the method of -2
measurement of blood glucose. I had to say this factor is not our dependent variable and
.even didn’t have any relation to our dependent variable

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Mar 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Apr 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.