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 Infection
Article DOI: 10.5812/iji.101639
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 7(2); e101639

Peer Review Report for "Antioxidant Property and Bactericidal Activity of *Linum usitatissimum* Seed Essential Oil Nanoemulsion (LSEO-NE) on *Staphylococcus aureus*"

Author(s): Roghaye Keykhasalar, Masoud Homayouni Tabrizi, Pouran Ardalan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 29 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Apr 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)

6 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
• The manuscript is to be re-reviewed in terms of literary writing.
For example Legend of fig1: PDI NOT PI
P value NOT p value
• Manuscript check again for italic form.
For example Staphylococcus aureus NOT Staphylococcus aureus
E.coli NOT E.coli
• The introduction needs to be improved:
I did not see the voucher specimen for any plant.
Who or what scientific organization approved your plants?
• The discussion needs to be improved:
The mechanism of action of nanoemulsion is not fully elucidated, please explain the cause?
Which of the essential oil compounds has the greatest effect on inhibiting bacterial growth?
Please explain the cause?
Thanks

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 8 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
It's an interesting manuscript about the antioxidant property and bactericidal activity of Linum usitatissimum seed essential oil nanoemulsions (LSEO-NE) on Staphylococcus aureus Strain.
The manuscript is well written and well organized. So, it's suitable for publication.
Regards,

Masoud Salehi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 9 Mar 2020

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.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Dear Editors:

We sincerely thank the respected reviewers for constructive suggestions and valuable comments, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. We hope our revised version of the manuscript has improved the paper to a level of their satisfaction. The changes are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.

The reviewers' comments and our point by point response to each comment are given below:

Reviewer 1:
Dear authors,
It's interesting manuscript about the antioxidant property and bactericidal activity of Linum usitatissimum seed essential oil nanoemulsions (LSEO-NE) on Staphylococcus aureus Strain.
The manuscript is well written and good organised. So, it's suitable for publication.
Regards,

Response: thanks for the comments.

Reviewer 2:
• The manuscript is to be re-reviewed in terms of literary writing.
For example: Legend of fig1: PDI NOT PI
P value NOT p value

Response: the corrections were made in text and highlighted.

• Manuscript check again for italic form.
For example: Staphylococcus aureus NOT Staphylococcus aureus
E.coli NOT E.coli

Response: the corrections were made in the text and highlighted.

• The introduction needs to be improved:
I did not see the voucher specimen for any plant.
Who or what scientific organization approved your plants?

Response: Here we have used the commercially available Linum usitatissimum seed essential oil (flaxseed oil, commercially available, Doctor Zarghani, Mashhad, Iran) and the plant was not used in this study. The S. aureus was purchased from Institute Pasteur of Iran and the ATCC number was mentioned in the text.

• The discussion needs to be improved:
The mechanism of action of nanoemulsion is not fully elucidated, please explain the cause?
Which of the essential oil compounds has the greatest effect on inhibiting bacterial growth?
Please explain the cause?

Response: Two main compounds in flaxseed essential oil including unsaturated fatty acids and lignin are responsible for the antibacterial activities (33, 34). Making the essential oils in the form of nanoemulsions, cause the oil constitutes to become more stable and hence have the better efficiency.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

• The manuscript is to be re-reviewed in terms of literary writing.
For example: Legend of fig1: PDI NOT PI
P value NOT p value

Response: the corrections were made in the text and highlighted.

• Manuscript check again for italic form.
For example: Staphylococcus aureus NOT Staphylococcus aureus
E.coli NOT E.coli

Response: the corrections were made in the text and highlighted.

• The introduction needs to be improved:
I did not see the voucher specimen for any plant.
Who or what scientific organization approved your plants?

Response: Here we have used the commercially available Linum usitatissimum seed essential oil (flaxseed oil, commercially available, Doctor Zarghani, Mashhad, Iran) and the plant was not used in this study. The S. aureus was purchased from Institute Pasteur of Iran and the ATCC number was mentioned in the text.

• The discussion needs to be improved:
The mechanism of action of nanoemulsion is not fully elucidated, please explain the cause?
Which of the essential oil compounds has the greatest effect on inhibiting bacterial growth?
Please explain the

Response: Two main compounds in flaxseed essential oil including unsaturated fatty acids and lignin are responsible for the antibacterial activities (33, 34). Making the essential oils in the

form of nanoemulsions, cause the oil constitutes to become more stable and hence have the better efficiency.

EIC Decision:

Dear Dr.
• The manuscript is to be re-reviewed in terms of literary writing.
For example: Legend of fig1: PDI NOT PI
P value NOT p value

Response: the corrections were made in the text and highlighted.

• Manuscript check again for italic form.
For example: Staphylococcus aureus NOT Staphylococcus aureus
E.coli NOT E.coli

Response: the corrections were made in the text and highlighted.

• The introduction needs to be improved:
I did not see the voucher specimen for any plant.
Who or what scientific organization approved your plants?

Response: Here we have used the commercially available Linum usitatissimum seed essential oil (flaxseed oil, commercially available, Doctor Zarghani, Mashhad, Iran) and the plant was not used in this study. The S. aureus was purchased from Institute Pasteur of Iran and the ATCC number was mentioned in the text.

• The discussion needs to be improved:
The mechanism of action of nanoemulsion is not fully elucidated, please explain the cause?
Which of the essential oil compounds has the greatest effect on inhibiting bacterial growth?
Please explain the

Response: Two main compounds in flaxseed essential oil including unsaturated fatty acids and lignin are responsible for the antibacterial activities (33, 34). Making the essential oils in the form of nanoemulsions, cause the oil constitutes to become more stable and hence have the better efficiency.

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.

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 7 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I agree to publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 9 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 9 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 9 Apr 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.