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.92521
Published in: Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences: 8(2); e92521

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Physical Activity on Cardiovascular Markers"

Author(s): Mehran Ghahramani, Sara Karbalaeifar, Abdolhamid Zokaei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 14 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 15 Sep 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) — 9 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. It is better to write the abstract in a paragraph.
2. The articles are old; it is better to use the articles in recent years.
3. It is suggested to design a shape for each part of the article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
- Abstract needs to be edited. Also get more complete.
- If more recent and more recent sources are used, the article will become more complete.
- Newer and more up-to-date resources can have more benefits.
- Sources are written more and more complete.
- In general, this article, due to the review and the results of various researches, can be used to prevent cardiovascular disease.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Jun 2019

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 6 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
This article is studied and it just needs some English revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Sep 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) 6 Sep 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.

Dear referees,

All the changes are marked by yellow highlights in the texts

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)** 15 Sep 2019

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