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

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.100594
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(3); e100594

Peer Review Report for "Co-Administration of Morphine and Naloxone: Histopathological and Biochemical Changes in the Rat Liver"

Author(s): Tahmineh Peirouvi, Yasaman Mirbaha, Anahita Fathi-Azarbayjani, Ali Shalizar Jalali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 15 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 5 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

10 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
In this study, the authors evaluated the effects of Co-administration of morphine and naloxone on Histopathological and biochemical changes in the rat liver. It is well designed and they showed interesting results with the consumption of morphine and naloxone on the liver. While several data are shown, there are some points and comments that authors should address them in detail:
Abstract
- The logic and clinical significance of the study are not well established.
- Groups should be defined properly.
- Write a conclusion appropriate to the study idea.
- Write the p values.
- Write the dose of drugs.
Materials and Methods
- Write a reference for the number of days.
- Write dose of xylazine and ketamine
Results:
- Write mean+SEM in the text.

- Do not interpret in the result section.

Discussion

- The results of the study should be compared with similar studies in detail.
- The clinical significance should be clearly stated.
- Write the strengths and weaknesses of the study.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 26 May 2020

Dear AE,

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

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 26 May 2020

Dear EIC,

The authors should answer the comments one by one, highlight the changes in main article.

Reconsider:

- Ethical considerations.
- Limitations.
- The digits in the results.

regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 May 2020

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the 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-in-Chief;

Please accept our team gratitude on behalf of your time and consideration. The answers to the respected reviewers' constructive comments are as follows:

Reviewer 1:

Abstract

Q: The logic and clinical significance of the study are not well established.

R: The aim of the study is added based on the dear reviewer's precise consideration.

Q: Groups should be defined properly.

R: Animal grouping is provided completely.

Q: Write a conclusion appropriate to the study idea.

R: The conclusion is revised based on dear reviewer's remarkable suggestion.

Q: Write the p values.

R: *p* values are added.

Q: Write the dose of drugs.

R: Drugs dosage is provided.

Materials and Methods

Q: Write a reference for the number of days.

R: Provided as reference No. 18.

Q: Write dose of xylazine and ketamine.

R: Provided as reference No. 19.

Results

Q: **Write mean+SEM in the text.**

R: Done.

Q: **Do not interpret in the result section.**

R: Revised carefully.

Discussion

Q: **The results of the study should be compared with similar studies in detail.**

R: Done.

Q: **The clinical significance should be clearly stated.**

R: Provided.

Q: **Write the strengths and weaknesses of the study.**

R: Included.

All the editorial comments are considered carefully.

Regards,

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 5 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.