Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Volume 21 · Issue 1 · e137796

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Oral Delivery of Insulin from Trimethyl Chitosan/Tragacanth: In Vitro, MTT, and In Vivo Bioactivity Tests

Alireza Khajeh-Amiri, Ali Maghsoudi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 May 2023	29 Jul 2023	29 Jul 2023	10.5812/amh-137796

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** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5

1 Original submission

2 comments · 10 Jul 2023 – 10 Jul 2023

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jul 2023

minor revision

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 10 Jul 2023

05-23 05:24:10
Control of Funding/Support: FAILED

The authors should provide Funding/Support information on the journal website: Read more here.

There is no webpage for the grant number or funding. Please provide the webpage related to your research project. This grant number must be searchable via www.google.com.
Correct:
Example 1: "....grant number is 1234-K (Webpage of the grant number: http://URL.com/1234-K) ...."
Example 2: This study was supported in part by grant 1234-K from the National XXXXX of Health and by a teaching and research scholarship from the XXXXX College of Physicians (Dr Fxxx).
Conflict of Interests Invalid 2023-05-23 05:26:01
Control of Conflict of Interests: FAILED

Please write meaningful words or complete sentences instead of 0.

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 Editor

1-The fact that we have claimed that the synthesized drug carrier has less toxicity and higher stability means that it has these advantages compared to the samples mentioned in the article that are based on chitosan. Also, raw materials for the synthesis of drug carriers are cheaper than other methods, such as methods based on lipids, etc.

2- The references were updated and our opinion of each was mentioned in the relevant place. This article is written in a simple and expressive language. In it, we have avoided exaggerations that hinder the correct understanding of the material. As the respected judges have said, the work is interesting. So, the author should not cover the interestingness of the work with too many complexities. We believe that if we support this and experience it in this prestigious journal, we can enter this field into an industrial pilot.

Thanks very much

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 29 Jul 2023

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 29 Jul 2023

Accept