OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (0)

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 whom it may concern”

Previously, we received a similarity report. We have tried to revise the manuscript accordingly.

Regards

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 "**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:

Peer Review

Health Scope
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jhealthscope.12903
Published in: Health Scope: 8(2) ; e12903

Peer Review Report for "Biohydrogen Production as a Clean Fuel by Acid and Alkaline Pretreated Mixed Culture During Glucose Fermentation"

Author(s): Mohammad Mehdi Amin, Mohammad Ghasemian , Bijan Bina , Ensiyeh Taheri , fatehizadeh fatehizadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 May 2017
Revised Date:	23 Sep 2017
Accepted Date:	9 Nov 2017

Revision (0)

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

Hossein Kamani : Reviewer

10 Aug 2017

Dear editor,
-Please write the abstract without multiple sections; write it in one section.
-Please describe all of the abbreviations for the first time in the text and in the abstract, such as rpm.
- ” rpm” or “RPM”, recheck it.
- The English of the manuscript should be improved. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect, such as: line 46 “operate or operation”, line 49 “can affect or can be affected”, “are depicted or are depicted “, etc.
- line 61, write the size of the pore.

- In the method section, how is it possible that anaerobic bacteria are very sensitive to changes the pH? Have you counted the live bacteria after changing the pH?
-You have used anaerobic digested sludge, why don't you write "Biohydrogen production as clean fuel by acid and alkaline pretreated digested sludge.
-Are there any references for the method section? Please write a few references for each paragraph.

- How did you measure hydrogen content?
- In Fig. 1, the Vertical axis is volumetric volume or volume? (You mention both volumetric and volume in text)
-Conclusion is weak.
- Compare your result with other studies, and explain your result according to the few related studies in the discussion section.

Best regards,

davood balarak : Reviewer 17 Aug 2017

Dear Authors,
- All abbreviations should be removed from the TITLE, RUNNING TITLE, ABSTRACT, and KEYWORDS. In return, they should be placed in the manuscript body and defined completely for the first time; afterward, only the abbreviated form can be applied throughout the text.
- The whole manuscript shall be structured according to the Health Scope style.
- It is substantially recommended to the authors to refer to more recent references rather than old and out-of-date ones.
Abstract:
- Abstract section should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion, as well as the conclusion. In your article, this part needs to be revised.
- Background is weak and needs to be edited.
- Keywords should not repeat the words of the manuscript title and should not contain any abbreviations
Introduction:
- In the text, please bold the importance and express BHP's application
- The last paragraph is poorly expressed. This part contains goals, novelty, the most important actions, and the importance of doing this study.
- The literature review of the previous studies and the main objectives of the research carried out in the study shall be explained in detail in this section.
Methods:
- Please add the reference method used.
- Please add the number and sample size used method
- The statistical method used to analyze the data is expressed
Results and discussion:
- Please read the recommended structure for the Health Scope style.
- Please add the number and sample size used method

- The results should be compared with other studies.
Conclusion
- This part needs to be revised and reinforced. Please read similar articles. It can help you to improve it.

Ferdos kord Mostafapour : Associate Editor

10 Sep 2017

Dear authors,
-Please write the abstract without multiple sections; write it in one section.
-Please describe all of the abbreviations for the first time in the text and in the abstract, such as rpm.
- ” rpm” or “RPM”, recheck it.
- The English of the manuscript should be improved. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect, such as: line 46 “operate or operation”, line 49 “can affect or can be affected”, “are depicted or are depicted “, etc.
- line 61, write the size of the pore.
- In the method section, how is it possible that anaerobic bacteria are very sensitive to changes the pH? Have you counted the live bacteria after changing the pH?
-You have used anaerobic digested sludge, why don’t you write “Biohydrogen production as clean fuel by acid and alkaline pretreated digested sludge.
-Are there any references for the method section? Please write a few references for each paragraph.

- How did you measure hydrogen content?
- In Fig. 1, the Vertical axis is volumetric volume or volume? (You mention both volumetric and volume in text)
-Conclusion is weak.
- Compare your result with other studies, and explain your result according to the few related studies in the discussion section.

- All abbreviations should be removed from the TITLE, RUNNING TITLE, ABSTRACT, and KEYWORDS. In return, they should be placed in the manuscript body and defined completely for the first time; afterward, only the abbreviated form can be applied throughout the text.
- The whole manuscript shall be structured according to the Health Scope style.
- It is substantially recommended to the authors to refer to more recent references rather than old and out-of-date ones.
Abstract:
- Abstract section should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion, as well as the conclusion. In your article, this part needs to be revised.
- Background is weak and needs to be edited.
- Keywords should not repeat the words of the manuscript title and should not contain any abbreviations
Introduction:
- In the text, please bold the importance and express BHP's application

- The last paragraph is poorly expressed. This part contains goals, novelty, the most important actions, and the importance of doing this study.
- The literature review of the previous studies and the main objectives of the research carried out in the study shall be explained in detail in this section.

Methods:

- Please add the reference method used.
- Please add the number and sample size used method
- The statistical method used to analyze the data is expressed

Results and discussion:

- Please read the recommended structure for the Health Scope style.
- Please add the number and sample size used method
- The results should be compared with other studies.

Conclusion

- This part needs to be revised and reinforced. Please read similar articles. It can help you to improve it.

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC

15 Sep 2017

Dear editor,

-Please write the abstract without multiple sections; write it in one section.

-Please describe all of the abbreviations for the first time in the text and in the abstract, such as rpm.

- ” rpm” or “RPM”, check it again.

- The English of the manuscript should be improved. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect, such as: line 46 “operate or operation”, line 49 “can affect or can be affected”, “are depicted or are depicted “, etc.

- line 61, write the size of the pore.

- In the method section, how is it possible: anaerobic bacteria are very sensitive to changes the pH? Have you counted the live bacteria after changing the pH?

-You have used anaerobic digested sludge, why don’t you write “Biohydrogen production as clean fuel by acid and alkaline pretreated digested sludge.

-Are there any references for the method section? Please write a few references for each paragraph.

- How did you measure hydrogen content?

- In Fig. 1, the Vertical axis is volumetric volume or volume? (You mention both volumetric and volume in text)

-Conclusion is weak.

- Compare your result with other studies, and explain your result according to the few related studies in the discussion section.

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.

Reviewer 1

- All abbreviations should be removed from the TITLE, RUNNING TITLE, ABSTRACT, and KEYWORDS. In return, they should be placed in the manuscript body and defined completely for the first time; afterward, only the abbreviated form can be applied throughout the text.

Thanks. It was done.

- The whole manuscript shall be structured according to the Health Scope style.

It was performed.

- It is substantially recommended to the authors to refer to more recent references rather than old and out-of-date ones.

Some new studies were added. For example, Ref Nos. 8 and 10.

Abstract

- Abstract section should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion, as well as the conclusion. In your article, this part needs to be revised.

The whole methods section was rewritten, and the other sections were revised. Page 1, Line 10-22.

- Background is weak and needs to be edited.

A better and scientific Background was provided. Page 1, Line 4-7.

- Keywords should not repeat the words of the manuscript title and should not contain any abbreviations.

According to the reviewer's comment, the more suitable keywords were replaced. Page 2, Line 1-2.

Introduction

- In the text, please bold the importance and express BHP's application

- The last paragraph is poorly expressed. This part contains goals, novelty, the most important actions, and the importance of doing this study.

- The literature review of the previous studies and the main objectives of the research carried out in the study shall be explained in detail in this section.

Thanks for your comments. According to the reviewer's suggestion, the whole INTRODUCTION section was rewritten, and we are trying to better presentation of PROBLEM, CONFLICT, and SOLUTION about bio hydrogen producing bacteria and supporting with proper REFs. Page 3 and 4.

Methods

- Please add the reference method used.

Thanks. It was added. Page 6, Line 7-9.

- Please add the number and sample size used method.

Please see the METHODS section. Page 5.

- The statistical method used to analyze the data is expressed.

Due to the concept of this study, as you can see, we don’t use statistical analysis.

Results and discussion

- Please read the recommended structure for the Health Scope style.

Whole manuscript body, including 1. Background, 2. Objectives, 3. Methods, 4. Results and 5. Discussion was structured according to the newest Health Scope instruction.

- The results should be compared with other studies.

We are trying to better comparison of the obtained results with previous studies. Pages 11 and 12.

Conclusion

- This part needs to be revised and reinforced. Please read similar articles. It can help you to improve it.

According to the REVIEWER comment, the Conclusion part was rewritten, and we are trying to improve better presentation.

Reviewer 2

-Please write the abstract without multiple sections; write it in one section.

The abstract was formatted according to the newest Health Scope instructions. In this instruction, the abstract was divided into Background, Objectives, and Methods, Results, and Conclusions sections.

-Please describe all of the abbreviations for the first time in the text and in the abstract, such as rpm.

-" rpm" or "RPM", recheck it.

Thanks. It was modified. Page 6, Line 3.

- The English of the manuscript should be improved. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect, such as: line 46 "operate or operation", line 49 "can affect or can be affected", "are depicted or are depicted ", etc.

Thanks for your suggestions. The whole manuscript was revised.

- line 61; write the size of the pore.

It was added. Page 5, Line 6.

- In the method section, how is it possible that anaerobic bacteria are very sensitive to changes the pH? Have you counted the live bacteria after the pH?

As you mentioned, the methanogenic bacteria are very sensitive to changes the pH and are responsible for METHANE production. But the aim of this study is HYDROGEN production by acidogenic bacteria, and it needs to be converted to methanogenic bacteria via pretreatment of the parent culture.

-You have used anaerobic digested sludge, why don't you write "Bio hydrogen production as clean fuel by acid and alkaline pretreated digested sludge.

We used the digested anaerobic sludge as the parent culture. But the bio hydrogen production was done by acidogenic bacteria after pretreatment. According to the reviewer's comment, the manuscript title was revised. Page 1, Line 1.

-Are there any references for the method section? Please write a few references for each paragraph.

Thanks. All method section was supported with proper REF. Page 5 and page 6.

- How did you measure hydrogen content?

As mentioned in the manuscript, "The hydrogen percentage of produced biogas was quantified by a hydrogen analyzer," and obtained data are presented in Page 6, Line 5 and 6 as "The volumetric hydrogen percent in the biogas was 49% for HCl, HNO3, H3PO4, 48% for H2SO4, 44% for NaOH, and 38% for KOH".

- In Fig. 1, the Vertical axis is volumetric volume or volume? (You mention both volumetric and volume in text.)

The vertical axis title is correct. The word "volumetric hydrogen percent" was just used for the hydrogen percentage of the produced biogas.

-Conclusion is weak.

According to the REVIEWER comment, the Conclusion part was rewritten, and we are trying to improve better presentation.

- Compare your result with other studies, and explain your result according to the few related studies in the discussion section.

We are trying to better comparison of the obtained results with previous studies. Pages 11 and 12.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Hossein Kamani : Reviewer — 23 Oct 2017

Dear editor,
The authors have adequately addressed all recommended revisions; therefore, the mentioned manuscript can be accepted for publication.
Best regards

Ferdos kord Mostafapour : Associate Editor — 25 Oct 2017

Dear EIC,
The authors have adequately addressed all recommended revisions; therefore, the mentioned manuscript can be accepted for publication.
Best regards,

Ramazan Mirzaei : EIC — 9 Nov 2017

Dear EIC,
The authors have adequately addressed all recommended revisions; therefore, the mentioned manuscript can be accepted for publication.
Best regards