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: 10.5812/mejrh.99754
Published in: Middle East Journal of Rehabilitation and Health Studies: 7(1); e99754

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Endurance Training with Royal Jelly on CRP Gene Expression in Muscle Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer ’s Disease"

Author(s): Mehdi Noura, Sajjad Arshadi, Ardeshir Zafari, Abdolali Banaeyfar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 25 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 28 Dec 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)

8 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. It is better to delete the names of statistical tests in the methods of abstract.
2. It is better to use Endurance Training instead of training in keywords.
3. The introduction should divide into several related paragraphs.
4. Please introduce the methods of sacrificing the rats.
5. According to the format of the journal, use subtitles in the methods section.
6. The author can delete F and μ inside the parenthesis.
7. Discussion section continues, it is better to divide into several paragraphs.
8. Some references (such as number 4) are not according to the format of the journal, so the references should be corrected according to the format of the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

13 Dec 2019

Dear AE,

Comments for the authors:
- In the introduction of the abstract, please introduce the effects of endurance training and royal jelly consumption on CRP.
- In the abstract, at the end of the methods delete the names of statistical tests and SPSS software.
- In the abstract, before CRP, write the full name and use CRP inside the parenthesis.
- In keywords use the full name of CRP.
- In methodology, note the reason for each statistical test.
- In findings, delete the F and effect sizes inside the parenthesis.
- Findings should be divided into different sections according to the results of statistical tests (induction of AD and the effect of ET and RJ).
- It seems that some references format needs to be corrected according to the style used
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The article entitled “Effect of Endurance Training with Royal Jelly on CRP Gene Expression in Muscle Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer’s Disease” was reviewed. The details are mentioned below:
Abstract
1- Introduce CRP in the background.
2- Use endurance training in keywords.
3- Write the first word of all keywords by caps lock words.
Methods
1- Note the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
2- Note that B2m was selected as the housekeeping gene.
3- Note the reasons for using each statistical test.
Results
1- Delete the F in the results text.
2- Delete the μ in the results text.
References
1- Some of the references are not according to the style of the journal, so revise again all references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
Abstract
- Please correct the abstract like the format of the journal.
- In keywords use caps lock words.
Introduction
- Please describe each topic in a paragraph and then discuss the next issue.
Methods
- Please explain why you have used any from any statistical method.

- Please provide more details on how to sacrifice and sample collecting.
- The method requires the use of subheading.
- Explain the conditions for keeping animals such as temperature and humidity and the cycle of sleep and awakening.

Results

- In results just report the significant levels, not more.

References

- Please correct the abstract similar to the format of the journal.

Thanks.

Amir Hoshang Bakhtiary: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,

This valuable manuscript has been reviewed by our peer reviewers, who reported that the manuscript needs to be revised in order to be more clear for readers. The authors should revise the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments and resubmit it along with a point-by-point response letter to the reviewers' comments.

Kind Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Dec 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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-in-Chief

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title "**Effect of Endurance Training with Royal Jelly on CRP Gene Expression in Muscle Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer's Disease**" first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. Abstract corrected like the format of the journal.
2. Caps lock words used in keywords.
3. In introduction each topic in a paragraph introduced and then discussed the next issue.
4. Reasons for statistical tests introduced in methods section
5. Sacrifice and sample collecting completely introduced.
6. Methods divided to related subheadings.
7. Conditions for keeping animals such as temperature and humidity and the cycle of sleep and awakening explained.
8. In results just reported the significant levels.
9. All parts of abstract corrected similar to the format of the journal.

Reviewer 2

1. CRP introduced in the background of abstract
2. Endurance training used in keywords.
3. First word of all keywords wrote by caps lock words.
4. Inclusion and exclusion criteria noted in methods section.
5. In methods section noted that B2m selected as the housekeeping gene.
6. Reasons for using each statistical test introduced.
7. In results section F and µ deleted.
8. All references corrected according to format of the journal.

Reviewer 3

1. In the introduction of the abstract more introduced the effects of endurance training and royal jelly consumption on CRP.
2. Name of statistical tests and SPSS software deleted in abstract.
3. In abstract full name of CRP noted and then CRP used inside the parenthesis.
4. Full name of CRP noted in keywords.
5. The reason for each statistical tests noted in methods section.
6. F and effect sizes inside the parenthesis deleted in results section.
7. Findings divided into different sections according to the results of statistical tests (induction of AD and the effect of ET and RJ).
8. All references corrected according to format of the journal.

Reviewer 4

1. Name of statistical tests deleted in methods of abstract.
2. Endurance Training used instead of training in keywords.
3. The introduction divided into several related paragraphs.
4. Methods of sacrifice the rats introduced.
5. Subtitles used in the methods section.
6. F and µ deleted inside the parenthesis in results section.
7. Discussion divided into several related paragraphs.
8. All references corrected according to format of the journal.

Best regards,

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) 23 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The author corrected all issues and the manuscript is acceptable for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The article can be accepted for publishing as the author answered all comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The authors completed all the comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The author has corrected and approved all comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Dec 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** (1) 23 Dec 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 (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

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title "**Effect of Endurance Training with Royal Jelly on CRP Gene Expression in Muscle Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer's Disease**" first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. The exact P- vale of findings noted in abstract.
2. The references for effects of RJ noted in introduction.
3. The Ethical Code of research added to methods.
4. Age, institution of purchased and maintenance of the rats noted in methods.
5. Figure corrected as reviewer noted.
6. The legend of figure 1 corrected.
7. About the scale of CRP in figure 1, it should be noted that as the authors measured the CRP with Real time PCR, the scale should be noted as Relative Expression.
8. The discussion corrected as reviewer noted.

Best regards,

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.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 28 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The revised manuscript was reviewed and it was found that all comments and issues have been addressed clearly. So, it is ready to proceed with the publishing procedure.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 Dec 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.