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

Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcmb.110734
Published in: Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology: 12(1); e110734

Peer Review Report for "Microscopic and Molecular Description of the Microsporidian Parasite, *Heterosporis* sp., Infecting Lizardfish, *Saurida undosquamis* in the Persian Gulf"

Author(s): Sara Larki, Rahim Peyghan, Zahra Tulabi dezfuli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 30 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 30 Dec 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)

8 Nov 2020

Dear AE,

The manuscript entitled “Microscopic and Molecular Description of the Microsporidian Parasite, Heterosporis sp., Infecting Lizardfish, Saurida undosquamis in the Persian Gulf” was reviewed. The working title is attractive and the methods used and the results are valid and valuable. Because the parasite of the group Microsporidia has not been investigated well, much more effort is needed particularly to clarify the biology and pathology in the aquatic world. This study shows valuable data on the parasite in Iran. So, I propose to accept the manuscript for publication provided that performing some corrections as follow:

- Line 7: change “causes” to impose
- Line 11: despite to “in addition”
- Line 14: “Saurida undosquamis” to a lizardfish, Saurida undosquamis”
- Line 20: what is xenoma? Please substitute with a more familiar word.
- Line 24: The final conclusion is not the correct understanding of your study. So, delete the final conclusion and substitute with lines 222-223 however with some modifications.
- Line 37-38: delete “, often instead of produce a xenoma,”
- Line 62: reword “H.s saurida” as its complete name.

- Line 63: “Arabian gulf” to “Persian Gulf”.
- Line 66 “phylogenetic survey” to “phylogenetic aspects”.
- Line 67: “is” to “was”.
- Line 74: where is “fish health laboratory”? include the locality of the laboratory.
- Line 116: “coding of the SSU rRNA region after purification using the….. Kit (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea) were” to “SSU rRNA region was purified using the AccuPrep PCR Purification Kit (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea) and”
- Line 118: Biotechnology company (Seoul, South Korea).
- Line 138: “observed” to “confirmed”.
- Line 148: edit “we could observe only the spores of the stages of microsporidian development”. I did not understand the meaning of the phrase.
- remove .1 from the accession numbers of genomic records.
- Line 163: correct this line.
- Line 170: add parenthesis to U47052.1.
- Line 176: “Arabian gulf” to “Persian Gulf”. Also, correct 32.1.
- Line 182: “is referred to as the” to “was referred to”.
- Line 188: what’s the meaning of “were caught”? correct it.
- Line 198: with to “from”.
- correct lines 199-200 according to language rules.
- Line 212: “no have” to don’t have”.
- Line 233: “blackhead” to “blackhead arrows”.
- Figure 3: what are the labels “PA 2 ” or “PA R2” indicate to?
- Figure 4: the fig has not good resolution and better to delete.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Nov 2020

Dear AE,

Microsporidian parasites are opportunistic intracellular pathogens, which infect a wide range of hosts, from protozoa to higher vertebrates, including humans. The genera members of Heterosporis, Pleistophora, Dasyatispora, and Kabatana, can infect the muscles of fish hosts. Heterosporis has seven species, which have been reported from fresh and saltwater fish of Africa, Europe, Japan, Taiwan, USA, and the Arabian Gulf (Al-Quraishy et al. 2012. Parasitology Journal). The manuscript describes a study on Heterosporis sp. in Saurida undosquamis in the Persian Gulf using light and electron microscopy, histological, and molecular techniques.

Comments:

- Abstract:

Line 9: Rewrite the objectives. Please note that the use of ssrRNA cannot be considered as an objective. In phylogenetic studies, the use of ssrRNA proposed as the main discriminator for relatedness amongst microsporidia.

The authors can say that "the main objective was the evaluation of Heterosporis sp. infection in…"

Line 13-14: …was examined using morphological and molecular techniques. In the method section, the authors must be mention the gene studied and the length of the amplified fragment. The method section must be rewritten.

Line 18-20: The authors have written the results in general. They should write the results in detail. For example: how many samples were infected with Heterosporis? And it should be clarified the results of each method.
Conclusion: Please clear how they came to this conclusion?
Line 49: Change Spp to "spp.".
Introduction: Please add some information on Iranian studies on Microsporidia sp. in fish hosts. (Please have a look at the published paper by Peyghan et al., in the Iranian Journal of Veterinary Research, Shiraz University, Vol. 10, No. 2, Ser. No. 27, 2009).
Line 64-67: Please rewrite this paragraph and make it clear that what were the aims of the study?
Line 71: the duration of the sampling should be added.
Line 73: Change Ahvaz city to "Ahvaz County".
Line 74: How long it took to transport until the lab? Was the transport made in a cold box?
Line 82-83: Add the thickness of sections prepared for H&E staining. Were examined all affected fishes?
Line 85-87: These lines should be moved to after subheading "Transmission electron microscopy section."
Line 92: Write concentrations of resin/acetone.
Line 93: Add Ultramicrotome specifications.
Line 102: have you used homogenizer?
Line 105: rewrite. What does "the majority of the small subunit… "mean?
The transmission electron microscopy section needs to include a reference.
Line 111-112: Add the final volume of PCR reaction as well the volume of primers, template DNA, water, Taq master mix…
Line 123: Were all the sequences mentioned the same? Have you included a reference sequence in the tree? The accession numbers of sequences used must be added to the manuscript.
Have you included an outgroup in the tree? If there is please write it.
I would advise to include a figure of TEM sections.
- Results: Fig 2 and 3 need to add arrows to show Microsporidia spores and cyst. In addition, figure 1 needs a scale bar.
-Were all microscopic-positive samples confirmed by the molecular method?
Figure 4: please rewrite the figure legend and add the percentage of sequence similarity with the reference sequence used.
Figure 5: Mark the sequences of the present study with a ballet.
- Discussion section: Line 18-183: Please add a reference.
- Conclusions section??????????
- Please add the limitations of the study.
The manuscript requires major revision and professional editing to bring it to an acceptable level of English language quality.

Niloofar Neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 9 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
Major revision is recommended by reviewers.
Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision (0)** 9 Nov 2020

Dear Author,
According to the highly scientific comments forwarded by reviewers, this manuscript needs to be revised. I strongly encourage you to answer/correct your manuscript point to point in accordance with the forwarded comments to avoid extra revision. English must be edited by an expert. A native English speaker is appreciated. Please submit your revision in no time.
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 of "Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology"

Thank you so much for investigating and sending the reviewer points. We revised the manuscript according to your requests and reviewers points. We answered/corrected our manuscript point to point in accordance with the forwarded comments. The question sentences of reviewers wrote with **red color** and the answer sentences wrote with **black color pen**.

Also, we edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago and get the certification; I send it to facilitate and accelerate the publication of the article because I urgently need this important.

I'm looking forward to hear good news from you.

With the best regards,

Sara Larki

Assistance professor of veterinary parasitology, Pathobiology Department, Veterinary Faculty, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran.

Reviewer 1:

Microsporidian parasites are opportunistic intracellular pathogens, which infect a wide range of hosts, from protozoa to higher vertebrates, including humans. The genera members of Heterosporis, Pleistophora, Dasyatispora, and Kabatana, can infect the muscles of fish hosts. Heterosporis has seven species, which have been reported from fresh and saltwater fish of Africa, Europe, Japan, Taiwan, USA, and the Arabian Gulf (Al-Quraishy et al. 2012. Parasitology Journal). The manuscript describes a study on Heterosporis sp. in Saurida undosquamis in the Persian Gulf using light and electron microscopy, histological, and molecular techniques.

Comments:

Abstract:

-Line 9: Rewrite the objectives. Please note that the use of ssrRNA cannot be considered as an objective. In phylogenetic studies, the use of ssrRNA proposed as the main discriminator for relatedness amongst microsporidia.

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-The authors can say that "the main objective was the evaluation of Heterosporis sp. infection in..."

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 13-14: ...was examined using morphological and molecular techniques. In the method section, the authors must be mention the gene studied and the length of the amplified fragment. The method section must be rewritten.

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 18-20: The authors have written the results in general. They should write the results in detail. For example: how many samples were infected with Heterosporis? And it should be clarified the results of each method.

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Conclusion: Please clear how they came to this conclusion?

Thank you for your significant points. We described it in abow lines in method and result sections and corrected it.

-Line 49: Change Spp to "spp.".

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

Introduction: Please add some information on Iranian studies on Microsporidia sp. in fish hosts. (Please have a look at the published paper by Peyghan et al., in the Iranian Journal of Veterinary Research, Shiraz University, Vol. 10, No. 2, Ser. No. 27, 2009).

Thank you for your significant points. We added it.

-Line 64-67: Please rewrite this paragraph and make it clear that what were the aims of the study?

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 71: the duration of the sampling should be added.

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 73: Change Ahvaz city to "Ahvaz County".

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 74: How long it took to transport until the lab? Was the transport made in a cold box?

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 82-83: Add the thickness of sections prepared for H&E staining. Were examined all affected fishes?
No all of them, one of cyst of each infected fish.

-Line 85-87: These lines should be moved to after subheading "Transmission electron microscopy section."

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 92: Write concentrations of resin/acetone.

Thank you for your significant points. We corrected it.

-Line 93: Add Ultramicrotome specifications.

Thank you for your significant points. We added it.

-Line 102: have you used a homogenizer?

We crushed different cyst particles and mixed them manually.

-Line 105: rewrite. What does "the majority of the small subunit... "mean?

A 1,279 bp genomic sequence was amplified from 1359 bp of the total small subunit ribosomal RNA of spores of the cysts and contained a partial sequence of the small subunit of ribosomal DNA (SSU rDNA). Most part or partial.

The transmission electron microscopy section needs to include a reference.

Ok, thank you for your point, we added it in text.

-Line 111-112: Add the final volume of PCR reaction as well the volume of primers, template DNA, water, Taq master mix...

Due to the limitation of the max word count: 3500 (including tables and references) of this journal, I have to summarize some details and shorten it. “PCR was carried out in 25 µl reactions containing 9.5 µl DW, 12.5 µl of 2×premix (Ampliqon, Skovlunde, Denmark), 0.1 µM of each primer and 1 µl extracted DNA”.

-Line 123: Were all the sequences mentioned the same? Have you included a reference sequence in the tree? The accession numbers of sequences used must be added to the manuscript.

We performed molecular study on similar morphological characters, then sequenced one of the amplified PCR-product due to high cost and read this sequence in both forward and reverse directions. We have included this sequence as a reference in the tree. The accession numbers of this sequence added to the manuscript as MT192526.1 in the GenBank database in line 159 of result section.

-Have you included an outgroup in the tree? If there is please write it.

We wrote it in line 125 of method, 3.4. part: Genomic DNA extraction; PCR amplification and sequencing as “Brachiola algerae (AY963290.1) was presented as the outgroup taxon”.

-I would advise to include a figure of TEM sections.

Unfortunately, we were unable to get a good quality image from the transmission electron microscope. Thank you for your advice.

-Results: Fig 2 and 3 need to add arrows to show Microsporidia spores and cyst. In addition, figure 1 needs a scale bar. Were all microscopic-positive samples confirmed by the molecular method?

Ok, thank you for your point, we added it in the pictures and text.

No, all microscopic-positive samples didn't confirm by the molecular method, because in some cases, each infected fish had more than 100 cysts in the visceral cavity, and on the other hand large numbers of spores were located within the cysts. All samples identified as microsporidia species based on morphological observations.

-Figure 4: please rewrite the figure legend and add the percentage of sequence similarity with the reference sequence used.

The percentage of sequence similarity with the reference sequence was written inlines 162-166 of the result section (Identity percent of sequences got from (BLAST) program in NCBI databases). This figure showed the compression of the multiple sequence alignments of the partial of the 18S rDNA gene of the Microsporidia sp. region with the most closely related species. This matter is added in the text of the paper and the legend of the figure.

-Figure 5: Mark the sequences of the present study with a ballet.

OK, we marked the reference sequence of the present study with the marker.

-Discussion section: Line 18-183: Please add a reference.

This sentence was written by authors of the manuscript and got using the other studies which referred to them, and can not find any references, separately.

Conclusions section??????????

This journal has word count restrictions and the manuscript is organized according to the journal guidelines. However, at your request, the conclusion was briefly added to the end of the discussion.

The manuscript requires major revision and professional editing to bring it to an acceptable level of English language quality.

Ok, thank you for your valuable notes. We edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago and get the certification from them, I will send it.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Chief-Editor

The manuscript entitled “Microscopic and Molecular Description of the Microsporidian Parasite, Heterosporis sp., Infecting Lizardfish, Saurida undosquamis in the Persian Gulf” was reviewed. The work title is attractive and the methods used and the results are valid and valuable. Because the parasite of the group Microsporidia has not been investigated well, much more effort is needed particularly to clarify the biology and pathology in aquatic world. This study shows valuable data on the parasite in Iran. So, I propose to accept the manuscript for publish provided that performing some corrections as follow:

Line 7: change “causes” to impose

Ok, thank you for your valuable notes. We edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago, according to one of the reviewers. Hope the new sentences were acceptable.

Line 11: despite to “in addition”

The sentences including “despite to” changed according to one of the reviewers.

Line 14: “Saurida undosquamis” to a lizardfish, Saurida undosquamis”

Ok, thank you for your point, we added it in the pictures and text.

Line 20: what is xenoma? Please substitute with a more familiar word.

Xenomas are the cells that undergo a series of significant morphological and physiological changes after the entrance and proliferation of parasites in their cytoplasm. These hypertrophied cells can be ganglion cells in *Spraguea lophii*, mesenchyme cells, a macrophage or histiocyte in *Glugea anomala*, mononuclear phagocytes in *Tetramicra brevifilum*, and neutrophile leucocytes in *Glugea stephani* and *L. acerinae* and endothelial cells in the gills are target cells of xonoma *L. salmonae* and *L. embiotocia*.

Due to the limitation of the max word count: 3500 (including tables and references) of this journal, I have to summarize some details and shorten it. However, according to your request, I wrote the familiar word as “hypertrophied parasitizing host cells” in describing the scientific name “Xenomas”.

Line 24: The final conclusion is not the correct understanding of your study. So, delete the final conclusion and substitute with lines 222-223 however with some modifications.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 37-38: delete ", often instead of produce a xenoma,"

Ok, surely we corrected it according to your request.

Line 62: reword "H.s saurida" as its complete name.

Ok, surely, thank you so much. We corrected it.

Line 63: "Arabian gulf" to "Persian gulf".

In the paper of Al-Quraishy et al., (2012) titled "A new microsporidian parasite, *Heterosporis saurida* n. sp. (Microsporidia) infecting the lizardfish, Saurida undosquamis from the Arabian Gulf, Saudi Arabia: ultrastructure and phylogeny". in Parasitology journal was written this form. However, it is against the Iranian will and patriotism of the authors, unfortunately, we could not change the sampling area of this study according to the personal manner of the authors, although it was heavy for us.

Line 66 "phylogenetic survey" to "phylogenetic aspects".

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 67: "is" to "was".

Ok, thank you for your valuable notes. We edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago, according to one of the reviewers. Hope the new sentences were acceptable.

Line 74: where is the "fish health laboratory"? include the locality of the laboratory.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 116: "coding of the SSU rRNA region after purification using the..... Kit (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea) were" to "SSU rRNA region was purified using the AccuPrep PCR Purification Kit (Bioneer, Daejeon, Korea) and"

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 118: Biotechnology company (Seoul, South Korea).

Ok, surely we corrected it.

Line 138: "observed" to "confirmed".

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 148: edit “we could observe only the spores of the stages of microsporidian development”. I did not understand the meaning of the phrase.

Thank you so much for your valuable note. We corrected it as “we could observe only the mature microsporidian spores”.

- remove .1 from the accession numbers of genomic records.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it in all of the text according to your request.

Line 163: correct this line.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 170: add parenthesis to U47052.1.

Ok, surely we corrected it.

Line 176: “Arabian gulf” to “Persian gulf”. Also correct 32.1.

Thank you so much for your significant points, the Phrase “Arabian gulf” was written in this form in the Parasitology journal. However, it is against the Iranian will and patriotism of the authors, unfortunately, we could not change the sampling area of this study when quoted it.

Line 182: “is referred to as the” to “was referred to”.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 188: what’s the meaning of “were caught”? correct it.

Ok, surely we revised the sentence and corrected it.

Line 198: with to “from”.

Ok, thank you so much. We revised the sentence and corrected it.

-correct lines 199-200 according to language rules.

Ok, thank you for your valuable notes. We edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago, according to one of the reviewers. Hope the new sentences were acceptable.

Line 212: “no have” to don’t have”.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Line 233: “blackhead” to “blackhead arrows”.

Ok, suerly, thank you so much. We corrected it according to your request.

Figure 3: what are the labels “PA 2 ” or “PA R2” indicate to?

In corrected manuscript this figure was corrected and extra letters have removed.

Figure 4: the fig has not good resolution and better to delete.

This figure pay to compression of the multiple sequence alignments of the partial of the 18S rDNA gene of Microsporidia sp. region with the most closely related species. I have tried to keep the image resolution as high as possible. If other reviewer s agree, we can delet this figure.

Reviewer 3:

با سلام

در مقاله فوق اطلاعات ارزشمندی راجع به آلودگی ماهی Lizardfish به میکروسپوریدین ها به دست آمده است که از نظر انگل شناسی و بیولوژی حائز اهمیت است لذا چند نکته و پرسش قابل طرح است که شامل موارد زیر است:

1- در مواد و روش¬ها به TEM اشاره شده است ولیکن در نتایج و بحث راجع به این تکنیک مطلبی وجود ندارد؟

با سلام و عرض ادب خدمت داور گرامی

1- بسیار متشکر از داوری ارزشمند و بررسی تیزبین شما، روش کار میکروسکوپ الکترونی ترانسمیشن (TEM) مشابه میکروسکوپ الکترونی اسکنینگ (SEM) می باشد که در روش کار مراحل آماده سازی لام نمونه های میکروسکوپ الکترونی آورده شده است. در نتایج نیز نتایج مربوطه به متن در نتایج افزوده شد.همچنین در بحث اطلاعات بدست آمده در قالب پاراگراف های دارای نتایج SPV و SPC آورده شده است.

2- در مورد میزان آلودگی به نظر می¬رسد تعداد 50 عدد ماهی جهت تعیین میزان شیوع کفایت نمی¬کند و لذا نمی¬توان میزان شیوع را بر این اساس تعیین کرد و با سایر مطالعات مقایسه نمود.

بسیار ممنون و سپاسگزار بررسی تان می باشم. بله حق با شماست در سراسر مقاله این مطلب اصلاح گردید و بجای واژه Prevalence از infection rate استفاده گردید.

3- در مورد توضیحات شکل 3 (Figure 3) به نظر می¬رسد توضیحات کافی نیست و به ویژه توضیحات راجع به دو عبارت Pa2 و PaR2 و همچنین اندازه انگل¬ها وجود ندارد

بسیار ممنون از نکات ارزشمندتان. طبق درخواست شما، عبارات اضافی مورد نظر از تصویر برداشته شد.مقیاس اندازه به تصویر افزوده شد که نشان میدهد اندازه انگل ها در چه حدودی می باشد. توضیحات مربوط به تصویر افزوده گردید.

4- با توجه به اینکه منابع به کار رفته نسبتا قدیمی است و از 32 منبع تنها 4 عدد مربوط به 5 سال گذشته است بهتر است چنانچه منابع جدید در دسترس است از آنها استفاده شود.

بسیار ممنون از نگاه تیزبین شما، حقیقت امر این مقاله ماحصل جدیدترین یافته های موجود در سالهای گذشته در این زمینه می باشد و تلاش زیادی شده است تا در حد امکان از به روز ترین مطالعات انجام شده در سراسر جهان تا به امروز استفاده شود. از 33 رفرانس موجود، 23 رفرانس در فاصله زمانی سال 2000 تا 2019 می باشند، 18 مورد از سال 2005 تا 2019 بوده است. امیدواریم شاهد گسترده شدن مطالعات در زمینه شناسایی میکروسپوریدیا در موجودات آبزی در سالهای پیش رو باشیم.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Major revision is recommended by reviewers

EIC Final Notes:

According to the highly scientific comments forwarded by reviewers, this manuscript needs to be revised. I strongly encourage you to answer/correct your manuscript point to point in accordance with the forwarded comments to avoid extra revision. English must be edited by an expert. A native English speaker is appreciated. Please submit your revision in no time.

Dear editor of “Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology”

Thank you so much for investigating and sending the reviewer points.

We revised the manuscript according to your requests and reviewers points. We answered/corrected our manuscript point to point in accordance with the forwarded comments. Also, we edited the manuscript for editing under editing services of Kowsar publication several days ago and get the certification from them, I will send it.

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) 16 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
The revised version of the manuscript entitled " Microscopic and Molecular Description of the Microsporidian Parasite, Heterosporis ., Infecting...." has addressed the points raised by the reviewers and is now acceptable.
Thanks.

Niloofar Neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
The comments forwarded by reviewers were revised in this revision of manuscript.
Therefore, I am agreed to accept
Dr. Neisi

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
It is my pleasure to inform your manuscript is provisionally accepted for publishing in JJCMB. As a mandatory rule all studies expect reviews must state/mention the study was perform in accordance with Helsinki Ethical guidelines under "Ethical approval" section.
EIC, Dr. Mard

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.

Dear editor of “Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology”

Dear Dr Mard

Thank you so much for investigating and guiding us. We revised the manuscript according to your requests and added the ethical approval part in new version of manuscript.

I’m looking forward to hear good news from you.

With the best regards,

Sara Larki

Assistance professor of veterinary parasitology, Pathobiology Department, Veterinary Faculty, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran.

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.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (2) 30 Dec 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.