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

Thrita
Article DOI: 10.5812/thrita.100004
Published in: Thrita: 8(2); e100004

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Metalloprotease Arazyme on the Expression of MMP2 and MMP9 Genes in Metastasis of Colon and Ovarian Cancer Cell Lines"

Author(s): Ghazaleh Amjadi, Kazem Parivar, Seyed Fazlollah Mousavi, Abbas Ali Imani Fooladi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 23 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 24 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

Seyed Behnamedin Jameie: EIC | **Revision** (0) 17 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 (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 indeed. Whole manuscript has been revised for plagiarism.

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) — 1 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled “The effect of Arazaim metalloprotease in expression of MMP2 and MMP9 genes in metastasis on colon and ovarian cancers cell line;” (Manuscript ID: 100004) was reviewed. The decision is rejected for this manuscript. The details are mentioned below:
• The keyword “Arazaim” was not found nor in PubMed Mesh, neither in Google search!
• There was no explanation about “Arazaim” in the “Introduction” and “Method” sections.
• There is obvious dissimilarity in usage of “Arazaim” in “Title” and “Abstract” sections of the manuscript:
- “Arazaim” is meant as a metalloprotease in the “Title” section of the manuscript. Conversely, Arazaim protein is mentioned as a bacterial anti-protease in the “Abstract” section of this manuscript!
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 3 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The subject of the article is very good. Please note the following:
The article needs complete editing and spelling.
1- I didn’t found Arazim anywhere the corrected word is Metalloprotease Arazyme.
2 – Abstract: must be explained clearly it is better to explain both cancers that you study with their prevalence in your country, as well as explain about Arazyme and the purpose of this study.
3- Introduction is very long and lacks the essentials things. The introduction should explain about Arazyme and provide some references in this regard. It is better to mention the prevalence of concussions in your country also, explain about MMP2 and MMP9 and the purpose of their in this study. Please write the objective at the end of the introduction.
4- Method: where is the ovarian cell line?
5- All of the figure should be change and need more resolution.
6- Results should be demonstrate by comparing significance.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks very much for submitting the manuscript to the Thrita journal. As we are facilitating our timely publication, we expect to receive the revised manuscript in 5 days. If we receive the manuscript after a month, we will consider your paper with lower priority.
Regards

Seyed Behnamedin Jameie: EIC | **Revision (1)** 3 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Please check the reviewer comments and revise your manuscript as soon as possible.
Regards

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,

Thank you for your consideration. All comments have been followed and mentioned in text and highlighted.

Reviewer 1:

1- I didn't found Arazim anywhere the corrected word is Metalloprotease Arazyme.

Answer: Arazym words have been modified in text and highlighted.

2 – Abstract: must be explain clearly it is better explain both cancers that you study about with its prevalence in your country, as well as explain about Arazyme and the purpose of this study.

Answer: They have been added in abstract and highlighted.

3- Introduction is very long and lacks the essentials things. The introduction should explain about Arazyme and provide some references in this regard. It is better to mention the prevalence of concussions in your country also, explain about MMP2 and MMP9 and the purpose of their in this study. Please write the objective at the end of introduction

Answer: It has been modified and also, some parts have been added according to your comments and highlighted.

4- Method: where is the ovarian cell line?

Answer: It has been added in text and highlighted.

5- All of figure should be change and need to more resolution.

Answer: The resolution has been modified.

6- Results should be demonstrate with comparing significant
Answer: The comparing has been highlighted in text.

Reviewer 2:

• The key word "Arazaim" was not found nor in PubMed Mesh, neither in Google search!
• There was no explain about "Arazaim" in "Introduction" and "Method" sections.
• There is obvious dissimilarity in usage of "Arazaim" in "Title" and "Abstract" sections of the manuscript:
- "Arazaim" is meant as a metalloprotease in the "Title" section of the manuscript. Conversely,

Arazaim protein is mentioned as a bacterial anti-protease in the "Abstract" section of this manuscript!

Answer: The word of arazym has been corrected in text and highlighted.

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.

Mona Farhadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 11 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this good article. The following is mentioned and details of comments are attached to the Word file.
1- All text requires grammatical modification. The abstract need to more revision
2- In the Introduction part: Please provide articles on the effect of Arayzim and the role of their change on two genes than in the discussion section discussed about it.
3- The shapes were not in this manuscript and no clarity in the previous file
4- Declare your data in the results and compare them with the groups
5- Compare all your assessment with others in the discussion.
Regards.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 27 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The authors should make the text of the article grammatically correct.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 5 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled was reviewed. There are some reviewers' comments at the bottom of the letter. As we are facilitating the reviewing procedure, we are expecting to receive this revised version in 7 days.
Regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 5 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you very much for submitting your manuscript to the Thrita journal. Please revise your final manuscript based on reviewers' comments and resend its revised draft on our website. You can track your manuscript using your account on the website. As we are facilitating our timely publication, we expect to receive your revised manuscript in 7 days. If we receive your manuscript after a month, we will consider your paper with lower priority.
Regards

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear author
Thanks to your good article. The following is mentioned and details of comments are attached to the Word file.
1- All text requires grammatical modification. The abstract need to more revision

Answer: The whole manuscript has been grammatically revised by friend's Dr. Pasalar (Editor-in-Chief)

2- In Introduction part: Please provide articles on the effect of Arayzim and the role of their change on two genes then in the discussion section discussed about it.

Answer: The effect of Arayzme has not been investigated on MMP-2 and MM-9. Our research was first study on these two genes. And also, It has been mentioned in discussion part.

3- The shapes were not in this manuscript and no clear in the previous file

Answer: it has been replaced.

4- Declare your data in the results and compare them with the groups

Answer: It has been added and highlighted in text.

5- Compare all your assessment with others in the discussion.

Answer: We have discussed our results with two researches which are similar to our study (References 18 and 19). As we mentioned, our study was first research in the effect of Arazyme on MMP2 and MMP9.

Regards

Reviewer 2:
Make the text of the article grammatically correct

Answer: The whole manuscript has been grammatically revised by friend's Dr. Pasalar (Editor-in-Chief)

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 24 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for this revision. The authors should check the pic unfortunately the pic has not correct size and the graphs had not resolution.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 24 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The article has been accepted, but it should be correct in the edited version (the proofs) the items referred by one of the reviewers in the discussion part, otherwise we will hold this manuscript.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 24 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
It is our pleased to inform that your article accepted in Thrita journal. please send the correction text based on reviewer comments in the proof version.
Regards