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

Hepatitis Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/hepatmon.103902
Published in: Hepatitis Monthly: 20(7); e103902

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Resveratrol on Thioacetamide-induced Liver Damage in Rat Models"

Author(s): Sahar Hosseini, Alireza Ebrahimi, Fereshteh Bagheri, Yasaman Emami, Elmira Esmaeilzadeh, Negar Azarpira, Sedigheh Ebrahimi, Soheil Ashkani-Esfahani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 23 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Jul 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mohammad Heiat: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

12 May 2020

Dear AE,
I have now completed the review of the submission “The Effect of Resveratrol on Thioacetamide Induced Liver Damage in Rat Models, Manuscript ID: 103902”. Considering my own examination of the manuscript, I want to inform you that this manuscript should meet some minor revision before other steps. While the authors have made an effort to improve the quality of the manuscript, it does not reach some standards for publication. I tried to categorize comments that are summarized as bellow points:
General comments
- Some combinations, sentences, and structures need to be revised and rewritten by a native specialist.
- Type of study should be noted at material and method.
Abstract
- The results part of manuscript should be re-paraphrase or completed. For example: “The groups treated with Resveratrol had lower serum concentrations of NH4, alanine-aminotransferase (ALT), and aspartate-aminotransferase (AST) ($P<0.05$)”. In comparison with which group?
- Keywords should be arranged in an alphabetic order.

Introduction

- I couldn't find firm integrity in the introduction part. More expertise is required to decorate and process the introduction.

Materials and methods

- Grouping and interventions should be illustrated.
- Fourth line of materials and methods: what is "ad" ??
- Ninth line of materials and methods: the units should be precisely checked (gr OR mg).
- Thioacetamide has been administered just one time, is it enough to reach Liver damage??

Reference 21 says: "TAA was injected intraperitoneally at a dose of 350 mg/kg on 2 consecutive days to all of the rats of groups". More ever it is not the original - "The plasma was sent for estimation", where do you send it? Academic writing should be respected all through the manuscript.

- Clearly define semi-quantitative scoring.
- To test of quantities between groups, the ANOVA test is preferred.

Results

- In general, the redundancy is a little high in the result section.

Discussion

- "I" should be defined at the first use.

References

- Use more up to date references.

Tables

- T1: Reference and measuring protocol is needed.
- T3&4: How the qualitative results has been tuned to quantitative scales. Also E OR S (Groups name), uniform name should be considered.

Figures

E OR S (Groups name), uniform name should be considered.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 May 2020

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author::

1- This study is about the effect of resveratrol on thioacetamide-induced liver damage in rat models which is interesting but as I searched I found out similar work that was published in 2020. So, the novelty of this work is doubtful which is need more survey.

International Journal of Morphology

On-line version ISSN 0717-9502

Int. J. Morphol. vol.38 no.3 Temuco June 2020

http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022020000300558

Suppression of Thioacetamide-Induced Hepatic Injury in Rats treatment with Resveratrol: Role of mammalian Target of Rapamycin (mTOR) Cell Signaling

2- All sections of this article have integrity and quite clear.

3- Introduction is too short and author would develop it to emphasize key points.

4- There some grammatical, punctuation and lexical errors in the body.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 May 2020

Dear AE,
The literature review of this manuscript is so low, did not use the updated references, the discussion section written so poor need major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 23 May 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript "The Effect of Resveratrol on Thioacetamide Induced Liver Damage in Rat Models" is an original work evaluating the effect of Resveratrol on the hepatic damage in animal models. the work was well conducted and the manuscript well presented the work. I think the manuscript is suitable to publish in Hepatitis Monthly.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
It was an interesting study.
- The study was well designed.
- The text was written fluently.
- Please explain more about how to conduct neurobehavioral examinations.
- Also, forced swimming without prior acquaintance with the aquatic environment can cause stress in the samples.
- If before starting the process to reduce the anxiety of the samples they were placed in the water environment (Mouse pool) please mention it.
Thanks.

Mohammad Heiat: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Jun 2020

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,

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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,

Thank you so much for following the review process of our paper.

Below you can find the responses to the reviewer's comments. I hope you find them acceptable.

Regards,

Reviewer 1:

1- This study is about effect of resveratrol on thioacetamide induced liver damage in rat models which is interesting but as I searched I found out similar work that was published in 2020. So, the novelty of this work is doubtful which is need more survey.
International Journal of Morphology
On-line version ISSN 0717-9502
Int. J. Morphol. vol.38 no.3 Temuco June 2020
http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022020000300558
Suppression of Thioacetamide-Induced Hepatic Injury in Rats treatment with Resveratrol: Role of mammalian Target of Rapamycin (mTOR) Cell Signaling

Thanks to your precise comment. The comparison between these studies were made. The main difference of our study is the neurobehavioral evaluation. Also, the method of pathological evaluation differs. The whole discussion is also rewritten accordingly.

2- All sections of this article have integrity and quite clear.

Thank you so much, however, some elaborations were added to the methods as well

3- Introduction is too short and author would develop it to emphasize key points.

The whole introduction is rewritten based on your comments.

4- There some grammatical, punctuation and lexical errors in the body.

The paper is revised by a professional English speaker.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor
The manuscript "The Effect of Resveratrol on Thioacetamide Induced Liver Damage in Rat Models" is an original work evaluating the effect of Resveratrol on the hepatic damage in animal model. the work was well conducted and the manuscript well presented the work. I think the manuscript is suitable to publish in Hepatitis Monthly.
Best Regards

Thank you so much

Reviewer 3:

Dear Editor-in-Chief

I have now completed the review of the submission "The Effect of Resveratrol on Thioacetamide Induced Liver Damage in Rat Models, Manuscript ID: 103902". Considering my own examination of the manuscript, I want to inform that this manuscript should meet some minor revision before other steps. While the authors have made an effort to improve the quality of manuscript, it does not reach some standards for publication. I tried to categorize comments that are summarized as bellow points:

Thank you for your valuable comments

General comments

¬ *Some combinations, sentences, and structures needs to be revised and rewritten by a native specialist.*

The manuscript is revised by a professional English speaker.

¬ *Type of study should be noted at material and method.*

Done

Abstract

¬ *The results part of manuscript should be re-paraphrase or completed. For example: "The groups treated with Resveratrol had lower serum concentrations of NH4, alanine-aminotransferase (ALT), and aspartate-aminotransferase (AST) (P<0.05)". In comparison with which group?*

Done. The result part is revised, and your suggestion is considered both in the abstract and the main manuscript.

¬ *Key words should be arranged in an alphabetic order*

Done

Introduction

¬ *I couldn't find a firm integrity in the introduction part. More expertise is required to decorate and process the introduction.*

The whole introduction is rewritten by a professional English speaker.

Materials and methods

¬ *Grouping and interventions should be illustrated.*

Grouping is now illustrated within the text, specifically.

¬ *Fourth line of materials and methods: what is "ad" ??*

It was ad libitum, apologies for the miss spelling.

¬ *Ninth line of materials and methods: the units should be precisely checked (gr OR mg)*

Done

¬ *Thioacetamide has been administered just one time, is it enough to reach Liver damage?? Reference 21 says: "TAA was injected intraperitoneally at a dose of 350 mg/kg on 2 consecutive days to all of the rats of groups". More ever it ia not the original reference, They have referred to Chu et al (ref #13).*

We decided on the dosage of TAA based on our pilot study. Because the effect of TAA on the animals differ from center to center. The reference was to show why we used saline injection for preventing electrolyte imbalance and also to show why we chose the injection route as IP. However, this part is now revised and better elaborated.

¬ *"The plasma was sent for estimation", where do you send it? Academic writing should be respected all through the manuscript.*

Revised

¬ *Clearly define semi- quantitative scoring.*

This part is defined as well as possible with a reference.

¬ *To test of quantities between groups, the ANOVA test is preferred.*

We discussed with our statistician concerning your comment. With respect, he said since our data are non-parametric, it is better to use whether T-test or Mann Whitney since using ANOVA and one of the post-hoc tests will render our data as parametric data which needs higher population.

Results

¬ *In general, the redundancy is a little high in the result section.*

Revised accordingly.

Discussion

¬ *"IPH" should be defined at the first use*

Done

References

¬ *Use more up to date references*

Updated.

Tables
¬ T1: Reference and measuring protocol is needed.

The reference for this table is mentioned in the method part. The measuring protocol is also based on the aforementioned reference. Elaborating the whole method would occupy more space and prolong the method part and all the authors might not be interested. We thought that interested author can refer to the reference provided in the text for further information. However, if you feel this is necessary we will do it.

¬ T3&4: How the qualitative results has been tuned to quantitative scales. Also E OR S (Groups name), uniform name should be considered.
Figures
E OR S (Groups name), uniform name should be considered.

As we mentioned, the measures were performed semi quantitatively, it is semi because the pathologist gives the scores based on his experience and knowledge and the overall evaluation. However, the outcome will be quantitative as reported as scores.

Thank you for your great and precise comments.

Reviewer 4:
The literature review of this manuscript is so poor, did not use the update references, the discussion section written so poor need major revision.

The whole introduction and discussion are rewritten based on your suggestion.

Reviewer 5:
It was an interesting study.
The study was well designed.
The text was written fluently.

Thank you so much for your complements.

Please explain more about how to conduct neurobehavioral examinations .
Also, forced swimming without prior acquaintance with the aquatic environment can cause stress in the samples. If before starting the process to reduce the anxiety of the samples they were placed in the water environment (Mouse pool) please mention it.

The examinations are more elaborated. The training courses are now mentioned.

The whole discussion part is also rewritten accordingly.

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.

Mohammad Heiat: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 4 Jul 2020

Dear AE
All comments have been addressed carefully and correctly.
The best

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The changes are applied and are sufficient.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Mohammad Heiat: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 12 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
I have finalized the reviewing procedure now.
- All Comments have been addressed correctly.
So it can be considered for publication without any other changes.
Sincerely
Dr.M. Heat

Seyed Moayed Alavian: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 16 Jul 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.