**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.116396
Published in: Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology: 12(3); e116396

# Peer Review Report for "Silencing of Long Non-coding RNA HOTAIR Suppresses Reverses Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition in AGS Gastric Cancer Cell Line by Downregulation of Fibronectin 1 and Claudin-4"

**Author(s):** Pegah Babapour, Maryam Tahmasebi-Birgani, Mehrdad Hashemi, Mohammad-Reza Hajjari

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 May 2021
Revised Date: 20 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 20 Aug 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Seyyed Ali Mard**: Reviewer | Revision (0) 10 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Having read the following manuscript entitled "Silencing of Long Non-coding RNA HOTAIR Suppresses Reverses Epithelial-mesenchymal Transition in AGS Gastric Cancer cell line by downregulation of fibronectin-1 and claudin-4", I realized that the study has got some novelty and is worth publishing in JJCMB. There are some minor concerns that have to revise as listed below:
- Abstract: remove the following sentence "To our
knowledge, this is the first time that the effect of HOTAIR silencing was studied on expression
levels of two critical elements of EMT." This sentence expresses the aim of the study and has to come in the last part of the INTRODUCTION.
Methods:
1. According to the Figures, results are expressed as mean± standard deviation. The SDS has to add to bars.

2. Titles of the Y-axis in the Figures are not correct. It has to change with this explanation " Relative mRNA expression of .....(Fold to Control).
3. Table 1 and primers sequences have to include.
Results:
1. Avoid interpreting the results in this part of the manuscript. For example: "suggesting that the siRNA inhibit the transcript successfully".
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
In general, the statistics are poorly described and it should be useful to report Mean±SD or (SEM) values in the text and figures with a number of cells analyzed. Also, in the statistical analysis section, an approach to testing normality is missing in the section. However, as you know if the normal distribution was not met, the nonparametric tests were recommended.
- Fig 1, 2, 3: Report Mean±SD or (SEM) values in the figures and the statistical analysis used to compare.
Thanks.

**Seyyed Ali Mard**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
Concern raised by reviewers suggests a minor revision.
Thanks.

**Seyyed Ali Mard**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
JJCMB for publishing your valuable manuscript. In accordance with forwarded comments by reviewers, your manuscript is worth publishing in JJCMB. However, reviewers of this journal raised minor comments that need to be revised. To avoid extra revision, please revise your manuscript painstakingly and point-to-point in accordance with forwarded comments. Mentioning ORCID of authors, and Funding/grant resources are mandatory in this journal. To write Author's contribution, please follow the format of the Journal by visiting INSTRUCTION FOR AUTHORS on the homepage. This journal expects to receive the revised paper within two weeks.
Yours Sincerely
EIC, 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.

*Reviewer 1:*
*Having read the following manuscript entitled "Silencing of Long Non-coding RNA HOTAIR Suppresses Reverses Epithelial-mesenchymal Transition in AGS Gastric Cancer cell line by down regulation of fibronectin-1 and claudin-4", I realized that the study has got some novelty and is worth publishing in JJCMB. There are some minor concerns have to revise as listed below:*
*1.Abstract: remove the following sentence "To our knowledge, this is the first time that the effect of HOTAIR silencing was studied on expression levels of two critical elements of EMT." This sentence expresses the aim of study and has to come in the last part of INTRODUCTION.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*2. According to Figures, results are expressed as mean± standard deviation. The SDs has to added to bars.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*3. Titles of Y-axis in Figures are not correct. It has to change with this explanation " Relative mRNA expression of .....(Fold to Control).*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*4. Table 1 and primers sequences has to include.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*5. Avoid interpreting the results in this part of manuscript. For example: "suggesting that the siRNA inhibit the transcript successfully".*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*Reviewer 2:*
*1.In general, the statistics are poorly described and it should be useful to report Mean±SD or (SEM) values in the text and figures with a number of cells analyzed.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*2.In the statistical analysis section, an approach to testing normality is missing in the section. However, as you know if the normal distribution was not met, the nonparametric tests were recommended.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*3. Fig 1, 2, 3: Report Mean±SD or (SEM) values in the figures and the statistical analysis used to compare.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

**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**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 26 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. This sentence has to add to the statistical analysis “The data are presented as mean±SD”
2. Show SDs values in Figures please.
3. Follow one format in all parts of manuscript “fn-1 and cldn-4” or “FN-1 and CLDN-4”
4. Replace “CLDN-4” with “CLDN” in last sentence of Result.
5. Follow the following format to write Abstract please. The format of Abstract in this journal is structured, i.e: Background, Objectives, Methods, Results, and Conclusions.
6. “M.Sc thesis” with “MS thesis” in Method.
7. Use the following URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/. to write keywords
8. Replace “HOTAIR” with “HOTair” in last sentence of Result, key words, Figures legend, and etc.
8. Figure 1: Y-axis: Replace “Relative mRNA expression of HOTAIR (Fold change to control)” with “Fold change (normalized with Gapdh)”.
9. Figure 2: Y-axis: replace “Relative mRNA expression of FN-1 (Fold change to control)” with “Fold change (normalized with Gapdh)”.
10. Delete second row in Table 1.
Thanks.

**Niloofar Neisi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Jul 2021

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,

**Seyyed Ali Mard**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Jul 2021

Dear Authors
It is my pleasure to inform you that your manuscript is now provisionally accepted for publishing in JJCMB. There are still minor topological comments have to revise.

Best Regards

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.

*Reviewer 1:*

*1. This sentence has to add to the statistical analysis "The data are presented as mean±SD"*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*2. Show SDs values in Figures please.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*3. Follow one format in all parts of manuscript "fn-1 and cldn-4" or "FN-1 and CLDN-4"*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*4. Replace "CLDN-4" with "CLDN" in last sentence of Result.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*5. Follow the following format to write Abstract please. The format of Abstract in this journal is structured, i.e: Background, Objectives, Methods, Results, and Conclusions.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*6. "M.Sc thesis" with "MS thesis" in Method.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*7. Use the following URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/. to write keywords.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*8. Replace "HOTAIR" with "HOTair" in last sentence of Result, key words, Figures legend, and etc.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*9. Figure 1: Y-axis: Replace "Relative mRNA expression of HOTAIR (Fold change to control)" with "Fold change (normalized with Gapdh)".*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*10. Figure 2: Y-axis: replace "Relative mRNA expression of FN-1 (Fold change to control)" with "Fold change (normalized with Gapdh)".*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

*11. Delete second row in Table 1.*

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

**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.

**Niloofar Neisi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 18 Aug 2021

Dear EIC,
Regarding the following revised manuscript entitled "Silencing of Long Non-coding RNA HOTAIR Suppresses Reverses Epithelial-mesenchymal Transition in AGS Gastric Cancer cell line by downregulation of fibronectin-1 and claudin-4", there are some minor comments that have to perform:
1. Abstract: $2-\Delta\Delta CT$ replace with $2-\Delta CT$.
2. Figures: it is necessary to show the values of Standard Deviations in Figures n1, 2, and 3.
Thanks.

**Seyyed Ali Mard**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 18 Aug 2021

Dear Authors
I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript is now provisionally accepted for publication in JJCMB. There are two minor comments should be addressed before getting scientific acceptance. In addition, I do appreciate mentioning of Funding/grant resources.
Best Regards
EIC, Dr. Mard

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

## 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.

1. Abstract: 2−ΔΔCT replace with 2-ΔCT.

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

2. Figures: it is necessary to show the values of Standard Deviations in Figure n1, 2 and 3.

**Author:** Thanks for the comment. Edited and highlighted as yellow

**OPEN PEER REVIEW**

**Revision (3)**

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** (3) 20 Aug 2021

Dear Authors

It is my pleasure to inform you that your manuscript accepted for publication in JJCMB.

Best regards

EIC, Dr. Mard