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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/mejrh.113533
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 8(2); e113533

Peer Review Report for "A New Drug Discovery Approach Based on Thermal Proteome Profiling to Develop More Effective Drugs"

Author(s): Elham Gholizadeh, Mostafa Rezaei-Tavirani, Alireza Emadi, Reza Karbalaei, Ali khaleghian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 13 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 16 Mar 2021

Revision (0)

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

Hamid Madanchi: Reviewer | Revision (0)

3 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. English language and grammar throughout the text should be improved.
2. Make sure the figures do not require a license.
3. It is not common to use a colon (:) in titles.
4. In vitro and in vivo should be written italic in throughout the text
5. Abbreviations should only be written in full the first time for example FDA is written in full in lines 10 and 36
6. Be sure of plagiarism
7. Some titles do not fit the text described. For example, in the text of the title " Drug discovery methods and advances" in line 52, there is no reference to drug discovery methods.
8. "The importance of proteomics studies", is not suitable as a title for this article, " The importance of proteomics in drug discovery" is suggested.
9. The answer to the question " What is the need to study??" in lines 69 -83 should be with reference
10. Improve the quality of shapes.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 7 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is well organized. Of note, English quality should be improved and must be rewritten in Journal's style; this is a mandatory step.
Thanks.

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision (0)** 8 Mar 2021

Dear Authors
According to the reviewer's and associate editor's comments, your article needs to revise minor. Please respond to the reviewers' comments and submit the required files for up to two months. In addition, some grammatical problems are observed in the manuscript. It is suggested that the article is edited by the native editor and send the confirmation letter for the journal during resubmission.
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

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled [A New Drug Discovery Approach to develop More Effective Drugs by Thermal Proteome Profiling]. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on my paper. We have been able to incorporate changes to reflect most of the suggestions provided by the reviewers. We have highlighted the changes within the manuscript.

Reviewer 1:

1. English language and grammar throughout the text should be improved.

Edited

2. Make sure the figures do not require a license.

Done

3. It is not common to use colon (:) in titles.

Edited. "A New Drug Discovery Approach to develop More Effective Drugs by Thermal Proteome Profiling"

4. In vitro and in vivo should be written italic in throughout the text.

Edited. *In-vivo*

5. Abbreviations should only be written in full the first time for example FDA is written in full in lines 10 and 36.

Done

6. Be sure of plagiarism. 15%

7. Some titles do not fit the text described. For example, in the text of this title " Drug discovery methods and advances" in line 52, there is no reference to drug discovery methods.

Edited, Deficiencies in drug discovery methods

8. "The importance of proteomics studies" , is not suitable as a title for this article, " The importance of proteomics in drug discovery" is suggested.

Edited

9. The answer to question " What is the need to study??" in lines 69 -83 should be with reference.

Done, the reference added.

10. Improve the quality of shapes.

Done, the quality of figures has been improved.

Associate Editor 1:

The manuscript is well organized. Of note, English quality should be improved and must be rewritten in Journal's style; this is a mandatory step.

Edited

We look forward to hearing from you in due time regarding our submission and to respond to any further questions and comments you may have.

Sincerely

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) 15 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Due to corrections by the authors, this manuscript can now be published in your Journal
Best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 Mar 2021

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

Fatemeh Ehsani: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
We are pleased to inform you that your article is accepted for publication in the MEJRHS.
We hope to receive the other qualified articles from your group.
Thanks.