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.98310
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(2); e98310

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Swimming Training and Royal Jelly on BDNF and NGF Gene Expression in Hippocampus Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer's Disease"

Author(s): Amin Dehbozorgi, Laleh Behbudi Tabrizi, Seyed Ali Hosseini, Masod Haj Rasoli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 21 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 8 Jan 2020

Revision (0)

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

Arash Abdolmaleki: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript needs some revisions. I put the comment on the manuscript please answer them.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I have several comments and suggestions for promoting the article.
- First, grammatically needs correction.
- The abstract and other sections need to be rewritten.
- The rest of the comments are in the attachment.
Thanks.

Alireza Bakhshipour: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 3 Nov 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Nov 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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-in-Chief

Thank you for your kind attention to my article in title "**Effects of Swimming Training and Royal Jelly on BDNF and NGF Gene Expression in Hippocampus Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer Disease**" first, reforms of reviewers were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. The title corrected as reviewer suggested.
2. All grammatical errors corrected by English editor.
3. All parts of abstract corrected as reviewer noted.
4. According to comments of reviewer 3 as statistical analysis test change to one way ANOVA, so the results and conclusion of abstract rewrite again.
5. The sentence “AD patients incur burdensome costs economically and socially, so that in 2008 they ranked third place of health care costs in US” in introduction deleted as reviewer noted.
6. The term “neuroprotective” corrected in all parts of article.
7. AD induction and the dose of ketamine and xylosine corrected and reviewer suggested.
8. As the statistical analysis test changed, methods and results rewrite again.

Reviewer 2

1. The term “*post hoc*” corrected in abstract and methods of manuscript.
2. The term “P<0.05” corrected in abstract and methods of manuscript.
3. As reviewer noted subtitles used for methods.
4. In methods section introduced have AD induction reviewed.
5. According to comments of reviewer 3 as statistical analysis test change to one way ANOVA, so the results and conclusion of abstract rewrite again.

Reviewer 3

1. All figures designed by GraphPad Prism software and name of groups in all figures corrected.
2. As the reviewer noted the one way ANOVA with Tukey *post hos* tests were used for statistical analysis of data and subsequently all results section rewrite again.

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) — 10 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
The authors did all comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 13 Dec 2019

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

Alireza Bakhshipour: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 17 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 17 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 (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 "**Effects of Swimming Training and Royal Jelly on BDNF and NGF Gene Expression in Hippocampus Tissue of Rats with Alzheimer Disease**" first, reforms of reviewer were respected in the article by red color and they listed below.

Reviewer 1

1. All figures corrected as reviewer noted.
2. In methods section introduced the reason for use the Shapiro- Wilk test.
3. The authors of present manuscript review the normal distribution of findings again and all data in each groups were normal.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 5 Jan 2020

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

Alireza Bakhshipour: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 8 Jan 2020

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

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 8 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.