**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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.89902
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(4); e89902

# Peer Review Report for "Exercise Training Enhances Expression of Tropomedulin-2 and ADP-Ribosylation Factor 6 in the Cerebellum of Male Wistar Rats"

**Author(s):** Seyed Jalal Taherabadi, Masoud Rahmati

**Review Timeline:**

Submit Date: 26 Jan 2019
Revised Date: 26 Apr 2019
Accepted Date: 18 May 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) — 13 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
- The present manuscript is novel in terms of the subject.
- Few corrections have been made in the manuscript.
To observe comments, you can find them in the attached file.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
"Significantly different, P <0.05" is true. Please correct it (P < 0.05).
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 24 Apr 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** (0) 24 Apr 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.

Replies to all reviewers' comments

Reviewer 1:

1-correction of keywords

It's done

2- Were specific primers designed? or you use primers of other papers if you use primers of other paper, please report their reference .

All primers were designed and synthesized by Sangon Biotech (Shanghai, China)

3- The quantity of forward primer?

It was true

4- Delete sentence "Three rats in each group were used for this analysis" because reported in the section "tissue extraction "

It's done

5- What materials were use in lysis buffer buffer?

1% Triton X-100, 1% SDS, 50 mM Tris-Cl, pH 7.4, 500 mM NaCl and 1 mM EDTA

6-secondary antibodies?

An anti-mouse horse-radish peroxidase conjugated secondary antibody

Reviewer 2:

1-revision of background

It's done and added related articles

Reviewer 3:

1- Significantly different, P <0.05 is true. Please correct it.( P < 0.05)

It's done

**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) — 3 May 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for their attention to the requested corrections.
- In section 3.5 real time-PCR, Concentration of forward and reverse prime must be reported, therefore they should write 1 µl of forwarding primer (10 pmol ) and 1 µl of reverse primer (10 pmol).
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 17 May 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.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 18 May 2019

Dear EIC,
This can be accepted after some modifications were done.
regards

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 18 May 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.