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.114260
Published in: Thrita: 10(1); e114260

Peer Review Report for "A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Role of Toll-Like Receptor 9 in Alzheimer's Disease: The Protocol for a Systematic Review"

Author(s): Nasrin Hosseini, Shabnam Nadjafi, Leila Janani, Zahra Faraji, Behnaz Ashtari, Seyed Behnamedin Jameie, Mona Farhadi, Batool Okhovat Isfahani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	8 Mar 2021
Revised Date:	19 Mar 2021
Accepted Date:	1 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

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

shabnam Razavi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript provides a protocol for doing a systematic review and meta-analysis in toll-like receptor 9 in Alzheimer's Disease. There is minor problem in this paper that has been provided as:
1- In the abstract and method section, provide general information about the study procedure.
2- Revised throughout of manuscript based on these titles:
Methods and analysis, Patient and public involvement, Criteria, Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcomes, Study type, Information sources, Search strategy, Data management, Study selection, Data extraction, Quality assessment, Meta-analytic approach, Discussion, and References, as well remove all unnecessary titles.
3- Methods section revised as "Methods and analysis" with explanation for it, and remove design subtitle
4- Remove "the aim of study section"
5- Provide a suitable explanation in "Patient and Public in research" section.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
This article is very good in terms of subject and writing style.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript 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 the revised version in 7 days.
Regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 15 Mar 2021

Dear Author,
Your manuscript 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 your revised version in 7 days.
Regards.

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 reviewer:

Thanks for your valuable comments. We revised manuscript point by point of your suggestion. The changes mentioned here, and has been highlighted or red colored in the manuscript. We would like to provide your satisfaction.

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript provide a protocol for doing a systematic review and meta-analysis in toll-like receptor 9 in Alzheimer Disease. There is minor problem in this paper that has been provided as:

1- In the abstract and method section, provide general information about the study procedure.

Response: Abstract has been revised as reviewer comments, and new sentences have been marked with red color. " Studies including assessment of TLR9 function in adults with AD diagnosis that were published…… for a systematic review that will identify TLR9 up- and down regulation in adults with AD"

2- Revised throughout of manuscript based on these titles:
Methods and analysis, Patient and public involvement, Criteria, Population, Comparator, Outcomes, Study type, Information sources, Search strategy, Data management, Study selection, Data extraction, Quality assessment, Meta-analytic approach, Discussion and References, as well remove all unnecessary titles.
- All of mentioned titles revised and provided related explanation for them with red color. "

3- Methods section revised as "Methods and analysis" with explanation for it, and remove design subtitle

- Methods section has been corrected as Methods and analysis
4- Remove "the aim of study section"

- The aim of study section has been removed.
5- Provide a suitable explanation in "Patient and Public in research" section.

- The "Patient and Public in research" section has been revised and has been marked with red color." This was a protocol for previous published articles…… were not necessary to assessed or included in any section of this protocol development.

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) 25 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 1 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks very much for considering Thrita journal for the publication of this paper I'm pleased to confirm that the manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Thrita.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 1 Apr 2021

Dear Author:
Thank you very much for considering Thrita journal for the publication of your paper I'm pleased to confirm that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Thrita.
Regards