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.108052
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(3); e108052

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Oxidative Stress in Patients with Fracture Admitted to Khatam Al-Anbia Hospital in Zahedan"

Author(s): Mansour Karajibani, Farzaneh Montazerifar, Faezeh Kazemi , Ali Reza Dashipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 13 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 25 Sep 2020

Revision (0)

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

Rohallah Mirjani: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 18 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript explores oxidative stress in Patients with Fracture admitted to Khatam Al-Anbia Hospital in Zahedan. This is an interesting work since oxidative stress in orthopedic patients is an important issue
Comments:
1- Please mark significant data in tables 1 to 4.
2- Are the patients' injuries severity scored?
3- It is suggested that; the authors should visualize the manuscript data (by graph or figure) so it would be more representative and understandable.
sincerely yours.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
With thanks to the worthwhile effort of the authors, the following comments are proposed.
1- The paper needs revision to correct grammar and writing.

2- The Abbreviations are not used in the abstract.
3- Some references are not written in the appropriate format (for example 13, 17, and 24)
4- Table 4 has not shown the significant changes, it has just explained the distribution of BMI. It needs, to be changed the last paragraph in the results.
Finally, I think this paper needs major revision to be accepted.
Thanks for your attention

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
Totally, the reviewers were a suggestion that this manuscript needs major revision and could be published but after correcting in some parts: A) The style of writing in some references (in the text) needs to be changed. B) The tables need to be revised. C) Abstract and the grammar of writing needs correcting in some parts.
Best regards

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
Article Standard: Not OK
Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions.
- Word Counts
We have detected the maximum allowed word count in your manuscript was not in line with the journal standards. For example, maximum allowable of word counts in a research article must be 3500 words while in your manuscript is 4700. Please modify/correct/change the text of your manuscript and try not to reach the maximum word count.
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.

To:
Editor–in-Chief , **Ann Mil Health Sci Res J**
Subject: Revising of manuscript **ID: 108052**

Dear Sir,

I have revised the manuscript as following:

Journal:	**Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research**
Manuscript ID:	108052
Title:	Evaluation of oxidative stress in Patients with Fracture admitted to Khatam Al-Anbia Hospital in Zahedan
Revision:	[0]

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
This manuscript explores oxidative stress in Patients with Fracture admitted to Khatam Al-Anbia Hospital in Zahedan. This is an interesting work since oxidative stress in orthopedic patients is an important issue

Comments:
1- Please mark significant data in tables 1 to 4? **Done**
2- Are the patients' injuries severity scored?

The subjects included patients who had been hospitalized with long bone fracture at the Orthopedic Ward Hospital. All of patients were selected by Orthopedic medicine and they didn't have severity scored.

3- It is suggested that; the authors should visualize the manuscript data (by graph or figure) so it would be more representative and understandable. **It is O.K. For a better understanding, the results of Tables 1, 2 and 3 are summarized in Table 1**.
sincerely yours
Reviewer 2:
Dear editor
With thanks to the worthwhile effort of authors, the following comments are proposed.
1- The paper needs revision to correct grammar and writing. **Done**
2- The Abbreviations are not used in the abstract. **Done**
3- Some references are not written in the appropriate format (for example: 13, 17, and 24) **Done**
4- has not shown the significant changes, it has just explained the distribution of BMI. It needs, to be changed the last paragraph in the results. **Done**
Finally, I think this paper needs major revision to be accepted.
Thanks for your attention.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC
Totally, the reviewers were suggestion that this manuscript needs major revision and could be published but after correcting in some parts: A) The style of writing in some references (in text) needs to be changed. **It is O.K. All references have been revised based on the journal format.**

B) The tables needs to be revised. **The results of Tables 1, 2 and 3 are summarized in Table 1.**

C) Abstract and the grammar of writing needs correcting in some parts. **Done**
Best regards
Minoo Shaddel

EIC Decision:

Article Standard: Not OK. **I try to revise of it properly**.

Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards, please make it as standard according to the journal terms and bellow Instructions. **Done**

- Word Counts

We have detected the maximum allowed word count in your manuscript was not in line with the journal standards. For example, maximum allowable of word counts in a research article must be 3500 words while in your manuscript is 4700. Please modify/correct/change the text of your manuscript and try not to reach the maximum word count.

It is O.K. The number of words in the previous manuscript was not in accordance with the journal standard, but it was subsequently corrected.Some references have been removed and the text has been revised

I hope that the response to the comments of the honorable referees is satisfactory.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Mansour Karajibani, PhD.

Associate Professor of Nutrition
Dept. of Nutrition, School of Medicine,
Zahedan University of Medical Sciences,Zahedan, Iran.Mob: +989153414358

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) 25 Sep 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.