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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.91482
Published in: Health Scope: 9(1); e91482

Peer Review Report for "Removal of Reactive Blue 52 by Electrocoagulation and UV/Persulfate from Aqueous Solutions"

Author(s): Somayeh Moghadami, Mehdi Vosoughi, Tayebe Sadeghi, S. Ahmad Mokhtari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 12 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 3 Dec 2019

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
My comments about the mentioned manuscript are as follows:
- Manuscript title is long and brief it if it is possible
- 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.
-Embed sections of abstract only in a section.
- In the abstract section, the Objective section is not necessary.
The English of the manuscript should be improved further. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect; Such as “Reactive dyes are usually soluble in water and they [are] applied for dyeing …2”, “ [figure] 2 illustrates the increase…”
- “Objectives” section after the introduction is not necessary. Embed objectives in the previous section(introduction.)

- substitute “material” with “material and methods”.
- Partitioning of material and methods is not necessary
- Figures legend is very long, brief them (figure 3, figure 4).
- Mention the other new related article in the discussion section.
- Why did you 2 process in this study, mention it? And what is the advantage?
- Many Articles are published in the Health scope journal that you can refer to those articles .

Best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 27 Aug 2019

Dear AE,

The description of experiments in the manuscript gives the impression of a professional approach to the problem. Work can be published in the journal after major revision.

- In the introduction section, the author needs to explain specific properties and applications of the Electro-Coagulation and Advanced Oxidation (UV/ElectroCoagulation at pollutant removal.
- The removal Equation should be written.
- There are some typological and grammatical errors. It should be corrected.
- They should write the whole units of formulas as in Formula 9.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Aug 2019

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Dear editor, Hi

Thank you very much to the Journal agents and contributors especially respected reviewers for their valuable comments on improving the quality of this manuscript, hereby thank again and inform considered reforms of reviewers had been done as much as possible and shown in red font in the text. Also, some of answers to the reviewer's comments are as follows (each reviewer separately):

Reviewer 1:

Description of experiments in the manuscript gives the impression of a professional approach to the problem. Work can be published in the journal after major revision.

Answer: Thanks, and inform that considered items have been modified as far as possible

In the introduction section, author need to explain specific properties and applications of the Electro-Coagulation and Advanced Oxidation (UV/ElectroCoagulation) at pollutant removal.

Answer: It has been done and shown in red font in the introduction section.

Removal Equation should be written.

Answer: It has been done and specified in equations 8 and 9 in the Introduction section.

There are some typological and grammatical errors. It should be corrected.
Answer: It has been done.

Write the whole units of formulas as in Formula 9.

Answer: It has been done

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor my comments about the mention manuscript are as follows:

-Manuscript title is long and brief it if it is possible

Answer: Title was modified.

- 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.

Answer: They are modified based on respected reviewer.

-Embed sections of abstract only in a section.

Answer: With respect to the reviewer's comment, abstract was prepared based on Journal format.

- In abstract section, Objective section is not necessary.

Answer: Objective section has been removed and merged with background.

The English of the manuscript should be improved further. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect; Such as "Reactive dyes are usually soluble in water and they [are] applied for dyeing …2", " [figure] 2 illustrates the increase…"

Answer: It has been done in much as possible.

- "Objectives" section after introduction is not necessary. Embed objectives in previous section(introduction.)

Answer: It has been done and modified.

- substitute "material" with "material and methods". - Partitioning of material and methods is not necessary

Answer: It has been done and modified.

- Figures legend is very long, brief them (figure 3, figure 4).

Answer: Their legend and title were modified (Summarized).

- Mention to the other new related article in discussion section.

Answer: Their legend and title were modified (Summarized).

- why did you 2 process in this study, mention to it? And what is the advantage?

Answer: Due to the advantages of EC process and low chemical consumption in the first step (EC: Reactive Blue 52 removal) and further improving of dye and specially COD removal efficiency in the second step (UV/SPS).

- Many Articles are published in Health scope journal that you can refer to those articles

Answer: It has been done and 5 papers were cited.

Best regards

Answer: Above all questions and requests were answered.

EIC Decision:

Dear author reviewer comments about the mention manuscript are as follows:

-Manuscript title is long and brief it if it is possible
- 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.

-Embed sections of abstract only in a section.
- In abstract section, Objective section is not necessary.
The English of the manuscript should be improved further. Some sentences are grammatically incorrect; Such as "Reactive dyes are usually soluble in water and they [are] applied for dyeing …2",

"[figure] 2 illustrates the increase…"
- "Objectives" section after introduction is not necessary. Embed objectives in previous section(introduction.)
- substitute "material" with "material and methods".
- Partitioning of material and methods is not necessary
- Figures legend is very long, brief them (figure 3, figure 4).
- Mention to the other new related article in discussion section.
- why did you 2 process in this study, mention to it? And what is the advantage?
- Many Articles are published in Health scope journal that you can refer to those articles

Best regards

Answer: Above all questions and requests were answered.

Thank you very much, Authors

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 3 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Reviewers' comments are included in the article and are publishable in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
Reviewer comments are included in the article and are publishable in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 3 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.