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.115390
Published in: Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology: In Press(In Press); e115390

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of COVID-19 Infection on Sperm Quality and Male Fertility"

Author(s): Hamid Piroozmanesh, Ebrahim Cheraghi, Leila Naserpoor, Masoumeh Aghashahi, Rahil Jannatifar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Apr 2021
Revised Date: 5 May 2021
Accepted Date: 5 May 2021

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)

21 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs a major revision as I attached the comments.
1. Please improve the English
2. In the 2.3. Assessment of COVID-19 Antibody section, the author got the plasma but in the next sentence says 500 mL serum, plasma is correct or serum?
3. The 500ml serum is correct for the ELISA test?
4. SPSS version 23 program (SPSS, Inc., USA) was utilized to proceed data is not correct
5. Please indicate the exact data of value in the text.
6. How many times the samples were collected in the patients' group for evaluation? Because it should be checked during disease and compare if the results showed increase or decrease.
7. Discussion needs revision. it should not be like the introduction. The author should discuss the results-based objective.
Thanks.

Niloofar Neisi: Reviewer | Revision (0)

24 Apr 2021

Dear AE,

Having read this manuscript raised some major and minor comments are listed below:
1. English has to edited by an expert
2. Introduction section should be completed by adding more new and related references
3. What were the criteria for the selection of COVID19 patients? in accordance with related published reports, researchers do not allow mixing PCR-positive patient cases with antibody-positive patients. Therefore, PCR positive patient group must separate from the antibody-positive group and re-analyze.
4. A typological error occurred in the whole manuscript. Microliter has to replace with milliliter.
5. The country and City of used Kits should be mention in Method.
6. Some literature reviews in the Discussion should be mention in the Introduction.
7. The legend of Table 3 edit as follow: Correlation between sperm quality and Control group with COVID-19 positive fertile men". Please edit the name of the columns accordingly.
Thanks

Niloofar Neisi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 24 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
In accordance with reviewers' comments, this manuscript needs a revision.
Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision (0)** 24 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
It is my pleasure to inform you that your manuscript has got enough quality to publish in JJCMB after doing a revision in accordance with raised comments by reviewers. I strongly encourage authors to revise it and answer the raised question point-to-point to avoid extra revision. This journal is expected to receive your revision within two weeks.
Please remove the word "virus" in title. Mentioning Funding/grant resource, Ethical approval, and informed consent are mandatory. To mention Author contribution follow journal guideline please.
Yours Sincerely
EIC, Dr. Mard

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 Jentashapir J Cell Mol Biol

Manuscript ID: 115390

The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their useful comments. We have tried our best to modify the manuscript accordingly and the requested changes are listed below. We also like to mention that the following changes are highlighted in yellow in the text. We hope the changes are satisfactory.

With Thanks

R. Janatifar

Regarding the given comments by the reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for your comments, the points are corrected as follows:

Q 1: English has to edited by an expert
Authors: We edited the manuscript according to comment of reviewer and we hope the changes are satisfactory. **Location of modification:** In the main text.
Q 2: Introduction section should be completed by adding more new and related references.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We carried out a series of changes in the Introduction.
Q 3: What was the criteria for selection of COVID19 patients? in accordance to related published reports, researches do not allowed to mix PCR positive patient cases with antibody positive patients. Therefore, PCR positive patient group must separate from antibody positive group and re-analyzed.
Authors: Infected individuals whose COVID19 test was both PCR positive and antibody-positive were actually taken to ensure both tests.
Q 4: A typological error occurred in whole manuscript. Microliter has to replace with milliliter.
Authors: Thanks. Your concern is correct. This point modified in the text.
Q 5: The country and City of used Kits should be mention in Method.
Authors: We added this point in the method section.
Q 6: Some literature review in Discussion should be mention in Introduction.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. This were corrected to best of our ability.
Q 7: The legend of Table 3 edit as follow: Correlation between sperm quality and

Control group with COVID-19 positive fertile men". Please edit the name of columns accordingly.
Authors: We corrected this point in the results section.

Regarding the given comments by the reviewer 2:

Thank you very much for your comments, the points are corrected as follows:

Q 1: Please improve the English
Authors: The manuscript was revised and grammatical errors were corrected to best of our ability. **Location of modification:** In the main text.
Q 2: In the 2.3. Assessment of COVID-19 Antibody section, the author got the plasma but in the next sentence says 500 mL serum, plasma is correct or serum?
Authors: We agree with your comment. This item was mistakenly written, but it was correct (50µl serum) in the text.
Q 3: The 500ml serum is correct for elisa test?
Authors: This was corrected in the section of discussion.
Q 4: SPSS version 23 program (SPSS, Inc., USA) was utilized to proceed data is not correct
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We added the version of SPSS in the text.
Q 5: Please indicate the exact data of p value in the text.
Authors: Exact p-value was added in the text. Thanks for your comment.
Q 6: How many times the samples were collected in patients group for evaluating? Because it should be checked during disease and compare if the results showed increase or decrease.
Authors: Due to the fact that the duration of the disease is two weeks, after the positive COVID-19 test, due to the physical condition, patients are able to take a sample once.
Q 7: Discussion need to revision. it should not be like introduction. The author should discuss the results based objective.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We carried out a series of changes in the discussion.

Response to respected Editor: Thanks for your comment. The manuscript was edited.

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.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 May 2021

Dear Author,
Your manuscript is provisionally accepted for publishing in JJCMB. Figure 1 is not included in the revision, please add it. Mentioning ORCID of authors and Funding/grant recourse are needed too.
Best Regards
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-in-Chief of Jentashapir J Cell Mol Biol

Manuscript ID: 115390

The authors wish to thank the reviewers for their useful comments. We have tried our best to modify the manuscript accordingly and the requested changes are listed below. We also like to mention that the following changes are highlighted in yellow in the text. We hope the changes are satisfactory.

With Thanks

R. Janatifar

Regarding the given comments by the reviewer 1:

Thank you very much for your comments, the points are corrected as follows:

Q 1: English has to edited by an expert
Authors: We edited the manuscript according to comment of reviewer and we hope the changes are satisfactory. **Location of modification:** In the main text.
Q 2: Introduction section should be completed by adding more new and related references.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We carried out a series of changes in the Introduction.
Q 3: What was the criteria for selection of COVID19 patients? in accordance to related published reports, researches do not allowed to mix PCR positive patient cases with antibody positive patients. Therefore, PCR positive patient group must separate from antibody positive group and re-analyzed.
Authors: Infected individuals whose COVID19 test was both PCR positive and antibody-positive were actually taken to ensure both tests.
Q 4: A typological error occurred in whole manuscript. Microliter has to replace with milliliter.
Authors: Thanks. Your concern is correct. This point modified in the text.
Q 5: The country and City of used Kits should be mention in Method.
Authors: We added this point in the method section.
Q 6: Some literature review in Discussion should be mention in Introduction.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. This were corrected to best of our ability.
Q 7: The legend of Table 3 edit as follow: Correlation between sperm quality and

Control group with COVID-19 positive fertile men". Please edit the name of columns accordingly.
Authors: We corrected this point in the results section.

Regarding the given comments by the reviewer 2:

Thank you very much for your comments, the points are corrected as follows:

Q 1: Please improve the English
Authors: The manuscript was revised and grammatical errors were corrected to best of our ability. **Location of modification:** In the main text.
Q 2: In the 2.3. Assessment of COVID-19 Antibody section, the author got the plasma but in the next sentence says 500 mL serum, plasma is correct or serum?
Authors: We agree with your comment. This item was mistakenly written, but it was correct (50µl serum) in the text.
Q 3: The 500ml serum is correct for elisa test?
Authors: This was corrected in the section of discussion.
Q 4: SPSS version 23 program (SPSS, Inc., USA) was utilized to proceed data is not correct
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We added the version of SPSS in the text.
Q 5: Please indicate the exact data of p value in the text.
Authors: Exact p-value was added in the text. Thanks for your comment.
Q 6: How many times the samples were collected in patients group for evaluating? Because it should be checked during disease and compare if the results showed increase or decrease.
Authors: Due to the fact that the duration of the disease is two weeks, after the positive COVID-19 test, due to the physical condition, patients are able to take a sample once.
Q 7: Discussion need to revision. it should not be like introduction. The author should discuss the results based objective.
Authors: Thanks for your comment. We carried out a series of changes in the discussion.

Response to respected Editor: Thanks for your comment. The manuscript was edited.

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) 5 May 2021

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