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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.104579
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(2); e104579

Peer Review Report for "Fighting Fatigue in Military Forces"

Author(s): Babak Daneshfard, Nafiseh Hosseini Yekta

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 May 2020
Revised Date: 7 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 7 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

Sayid Mahdi Mirghazanfari: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 11 May 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Is JADVAR accessible in Iran easily?
- Please mention to sample size of the study
- What were the criteria of fatigue assessment?
Thanks.

Manijeh Soleimanifar: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 16 May 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for doing this valuable research, the result will be useful in medicine and sport.
Here are some notes to improve the recent research:
1- As a whole, this paper was not in the structural format of the journal. Please read the instruction file for authors on the home page of the journal.
2- In the first part, it is better to explain the physiological effects of fatigue and express scientifically that, how this herbal intervention reduces the fatigue side effect.
3- Introduce the method of sampling, number of sampling, the way of your recruitment,…
4- What was your criteria about fatigue, how did you create fatigue in your subject.
5- The file doesn't have any introduction, method, and material, result, and discussion parts.

Please rewrite the paper based on journal default.

6- It seems that it will be as a paper to the editor.

Thanks.

Sayid Mahdi Mirghazanfari: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Jun 2020

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,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Jun 2020

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.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Reviewer1:
Dear Author
Thanks for doing this valuable research, the result will be useful in medicine and sport. Here are some notes to improve the recent research.
1- As a whole, this paper was not in structural format of journal. Please read the instruction file for authors in the home page of journal.
2- In first part, it is better to explain about the physiological effects of fatigue and express scientifically that, how this herbal intervention reduce the fatigue side effect.
3- Introduce the method of sampling, number of sampling, the way of your recruitment, …
4- What was your criteria about fatigue, how did you create fatigue in your subject.
5- The file doesn have any introduction, method and material, result and discussion parts.please rewrite the paper based on journal default.
6- It seems that it will be as a paper to editor.

*Thanks for your comments. Considering that this submission was a "**letter to editor**" and not a full length "original article" (as you have mentioned in your last comment), many of these comments is not applicable in this paper. However, some explanations about sample size and fatigue assessment was added to the paper for more clarifications.*

Reviewer2:
-Is JADVAR accessible in Iran easily?

The row material is mainly imported, but the manufactured product is available in Iran. It has been produced as WEACURE® (Habb-e-Jadwar) capsules manufactured by Shefanegar Nazari pharmaceutical corporation, Qom, Iran

-please mention to sample size of the study

It was added to the paper.

-What was the criteria of fatigue assessment?

As it has been fully explained in the referred previous study, Persian version of Multidimensional Fatigue Inventory (MFI) questionnaire as a standard tool was used for fatigue assessment. It was added to the paper.

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.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Jul 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.