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.114563
Published in: International Journal of Infection: 8(4); e114563

Peer Review Report for "Investigating the Antimicrobial Effects of *Glycyrrhiza glabra* and *Salvia officinalis* Ethanolic Extract Against *Helicobacter pylori*"

Author(s): Moharam Valizadeh, Fazal ur Rehman , Mohammad Amir Hassanzadeh, Maryam Beigomi, Bahman Fazeli-Nasab

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 8 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 17 Jun 2021

Revision (0)

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

Ali Mehrabi Tavana: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- You did not use the standard strain of H.pylori for antibiotic sensitivity test explain that first.
Use very new references like ref 4, 5, 6 in both introduction and discussion sections.
- Evaluation of the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra l .which is suin Iran which is support you work like by A Jafari-Sales · 2018 ·
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Comments on a manuscript entitled " Antibiotic-Resistant and investigation of the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra ethanolic extract against Helicobacter Pylori" for the Int J Infect.

This study Isolated Helicobacter Pylori Antibiotic-Resistant Genes from endometrium biopsy of the stomach of patients and invested the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra ethanolic extract. No clear and significant result is provided. Only the general details of the article are described. However, in recent years, several studies have been conducted on the Antibiotic effects in herbal medication, and the present study does not provide new information in this regard. Eventually, it is a repetition of previous studies and lacks novelty. If not, please introduce the highlights of the MS. Also, it needs some major revisions as follow:

1. In the background author said “The aim of this study is Isolating Helicobacter Pylori Antibiotic-Resistant Genes and investigating the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra ethanolic extract”, But no information about gene testing is mentioned.
2. The English language of the manuscript is not sufficient and English editing is highly recommended. For example, the last paragraph in the abstract and all the text.
3. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, In addition, all abbreviations used in each table should be defined below that table.
4. Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search".
5. Use the same pattern to write the article. The author should pay attention to the main format of the journal and references.
6. The statistical tests used in this research should be fully introduced.
7. Several parameters have been measured in this study. The author should explain the method of measuring each in the method section. It is recommended to use photos and documentary images.
8. The discussion section has been very short. It is suggested that more detailed comparisons be made with other studies.
9. The final conclusion still needs correction. The most important details of the study should be mentioned.
10. Half of the references are old. It is better to use newer references.

Final decision: major revision.

Kindest Regards

Mehdi Azami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Apr 2021

Dear AE,

It's an interesting manuscript about the antibiotic-resistant and investigation of the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra ethanolic extract against Helicobacter Pylori. This article is well organized and well written. But the authors should change their aim in the abstract and in the full text of the article. Since they have not identified any resistance genes, it makes no sense to use the word gene for the purpose of the article.

- Also, in some parts of the article, words are written in capital letters that need to be corrected.
- It is better for authors to use photos related to their article instead of using the photos that are available on the Internet.

Regards,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 May 2021

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,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (0) 1 May 2021

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

Hello

The article was revised based on the referee's comments and the revised text highlighted by yellow color in the article. The revise text was conducted based on the below information.

Authors

2021-05-03

Reviewer 1:

But you should be change your aim in the abstract and in the full text of your article. Since you have not identified any resistance genes, it makes no sense to use the word gene in the purpose of the article.

This section was revised

Also, in some parts of the article, words are written in capital letters that need to be corrected.

The words were revised

It is better for authors to use photos related to their article instead of using the photos that are available on the Internet.

The new photo was changed instead of the previous

Reviewer 2:

1. In background author said "The aim of this study is Isolating Helicobacter Pylori Antibiotic Resistant Genes and investigating the antimicrobial effects of Glycyrrhiza glabra ethanolic extract", But no information about gene testing is mentioned.

This section was revised

2. The english language of the manuscript is not sufficient and English editing is highly recommended. For example, last paragraph in abstract and all the text.

The article language was revised by English teacher

3. All abbreviations should be defined when they are used for the first time, In addition, all abbreviations used in each table, should be defined bellow that table.

It was revised

4. Keywords should be selected from MeSH Headings, not MeSH entries. You can find the appropriate keywords on "Mesh Browser" at "https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search".

The key words was revised based on the reviewer comment

5. Use the same pattern to write the article. The author should pay attention to the main format of the journal and references.

The references were written based on the journal guide

6. The statistical tests used in this research should be fully introduced.

It was revised

7. Several parameters have been measured in this study. The author should explain the method of measuring each in the method section. It is recommended to use photos and documentary images.

The photos of the plant was changed

8. The discussion section has been very short. It is suggested that more detailed comparisons be made with other studies.

This section was revised and written more

9. The final conclusion still needs correction. The most important details of the study should be mentioned.

It was revised

10. Half of the references are old. It is better to use newer references.

The reference number must be less than 30 based on the journal policy as the result of we have to observe the policy but we try to renew some of them

Reviewer 3:

You did not use the standard strain of H.pylori for antibiotic sensitivity test explain that first.

Unfortunately we did not have to use

My distance from the sales centers is long and in some orders, the shipments are destroyed, which has already happened for another of our orders.

Use very new references like ref 4, 5, 6 in both introduction and discussion sections.

The reference number must be less than 30 based on the journal policy as the result of we have to observe the policy but we try to renew some of them

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) 8 May 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1- You did not use the standard strain of H.pylori for antibiotic sensitivity test explain that first in your article in Material and Methods section.
2- Replace very new references in order to update your article anyway.
Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 22 May 2021

Dear AE,
The authors modified all parts of the manuscript which the reviewers mention and added some new information as well and this version of the manuscript is appropriate for accepting.
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 May 2021

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** (1) 22 May 2021

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 (2)

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

Hello

The article was revised based on the referee's comments and the revised text highlighted by yellow color in the article. The revise text was conducted based on the below information.

Authors

2021-05-22

Reviewer 2:

Dear Authors,

1-You did not use the standard strain of H.pylori for antibiotic sensitivity test explain that first in your article in Material and Methods section.

The comment was revised and added in the article text

2-Replace very new references in order to update your article anyway.

This section was revised

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should check the grammar and editing again (i.e in line 30, In addition, when using a medicinal plant in. Treatment of a particular type of disease should....
Thanks.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 2021

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,

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (2) 7 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
Check the grammar and editing again (i.e in line 30, In addition, when using a medicinal plant in. Treatment of a particular type of disease should..
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Hello

The article was revised based on the referee's comments and the revised text highlighted by yellow color in the article. The revise text was conducted based on the below information.

Authors

2021-06-07

Reviewer 1:

Check the grammar and editing again (i.e in line 30, In addition, when using a medicinal plant in.

Treatment of a particular type of disease should ….

This section was revised

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 14 Jun 2021

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

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 17 Jun 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Hamidreza Kouhpayeh: EIC | **Revision** (3) 17 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
This article has been accepted.
Thanks.