Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Volume 19 · Issue 4 · e121231

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Healing Effects of Iranian Dwarf Elder on Full-thickness Epidermal Thermal Injury in Wistar Rats

Hosein Mohamadi Haftador, maliheh nobakht, Mitra Yousefpour, Ali Sobhanizadeh, Laya Ghahari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
19 Nov 2021	10 Dec 2021	10 Dec 2021	10.5812/amh.121231

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 8

1 Original submission

4 comments · 20 Nov 2021 – 28 Nov 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 20 Nov 2021

Dear author
I think this manuscript is very well written and its results are valuable, but I suggest that the results be compared with those of other natural products.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 28 Nov 2021

Authors need to edit the conclusions in accordance with the results of their research.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 28 Nov 2021

Minor revision is recommended.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 28 Nov 2021

Authors' Contribution: Not OK

The authors should state the Authors' Contribution on the journal website: Read more here.

* In "Authors' Contribution", the authors' first and last names must be written using only their first letters.

* Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Reviewers

Thank you very much for your suggestions. Here are the corrections made.

1- The conclusion was edited based on the reviewer's viewpoint.
2- The corrected word and sentences are marked with red color.
3- The ethics committee name and approval code were added in the method section.
4- The measurement of wound area and formula of the wound healing Was placed in the method section.
5- The references were corrected according to the journal instructions.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 6 Dec 2021

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Dec 2021

Article Standard: Not OK
Your manuscript did not follow the journal's standards. Please revise it to conform to the journal's requirements and the instructions below.
- Figures
1. The figures should be uploaded as separate files on the journal website.
To read more about figures, refer here, and to read more about the formula, refer here.
- Revised File Control
We strongly request your replies and revisions in response to the reviewers' comments, as follows:
1) You must reply to all reviewers' comments one by one, with line numbers and numbering. Read more here.
Conflict of Interests: Not OK
The authors should state any possible conflicts of interest on the journal website. Read more here.
* Please write meaningful and complete sentences and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Response to Reviewer1

Thanks to the constructive guidance, your suggestion will be done in the next studies.

Response to Reviewer 2

Thank you very much for your suggestions. Here are the corrections made.

1- The conclusion was edited based on the reviewer's viewpoint.
2- In line 43 “antibiotics” changed to antibiotic
3- In line 54 “The clinical” changed to clinical
4- In line 58 “Aja” changed to AJA
5- In line 117 “In” changed to in

Response to Reviewer 3

Thank you very much for your suggestions. Here are the corrections made.

1-The grammatical corrections were made.

2- The ethics committee name and approval code were added in line 60 in the method section.
3- The conclusion was edited based on the reviewer's viewpoint.
4- The measurement of wound area and formula of the wound healing Was placed in lines 76-79 in the method section.
5- The measurement of wound healing formula mentioned in line 78
6- The references were corrected according to the journal instructions.

Response to EIC Decision

Thank you very much for your suggestions. All of the comments were done.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 10 Dec 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 10 Dec 2021

Accept