Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research
Volume 21 · Issue 1 · e127031

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Phytochemical Analysis and Biological Activity of *Salvia compressa* Vent.

Firoozeh Noorbakhsh, Amir Reza Jassbi, Somayeh Zare, Omidreza Firuzi, Amirhossein Sakhteman, Jima N. Chandran, Bernd Schneider

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
25 Apr 2022	1 Aug 2022	11 Aug 2022	10.5812/ijpr-127031

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 Referee 1 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dr. Soraya Shahhosseini

Editor-in-Chief, Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research

Dear Dr. Shahhosseini

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript, "Phytochemical Analysis and Biological Activities of *Salvia compressa* Vent." (Manuscript ID:127031). Also, it is my great honor to receive the associate editor, the reviewers, and your constructive comments and suggestions, which helped us remarkably improve our manuscript. We have implemented the comments in the text and highlighted the changes within them. Here are your comments and our point-by-point responses to them. I wish now the manuscript could be reconsidered for publication in your esteemed journal.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Dr. Amir Reza Jassbi

Medicinal and Natural Products Chemistry Research Center,

Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

Editor comments:

Comment E1:

In spectral data part, at page 4 please write compound 1, compound 2, and so on instead of writing the compound name.
Citrostadienol (1) -> Compound 1
β-Sitosterol (2) -> Compound 2
Geraniol -> Compound 5

Our Answer 1:

Thank you very much for your comments. We have replaced the repeated names of the compounds with the compounds' numbers and highlighted them in green in the text

Comment E2:

In spectral part, if possible, please add the mass data of compounds 1, 3, and 4.

Our Answer 2:

We have tried to run the mass spectral data for the compounds, but it seems that the compounds are degraded. Since, the compounds are known and by comparing the ^{13}C NMR and ^{1}H NMR data identification are completed and compared with the literature data.

Comment E3:

In page 8 "The approximate positions of the acyl substitutions on the glycerol moieties of the glycerides is deduced from the 1H- and 13C NMR chemical shifts of the respective C(H)-1 to C(H)-2 signals."

Please change it as follows:

Compound 3, and 4 were identified as two different glyceride. The approximate positions of the acyl substitutions on the glycerol moieties of the glycerides is deduced from the 1H- and 13C NMR chemical shifts of the respective C(H)-1 to C(H)-2 signals.

In page 10 "Geraniol or (2E)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dien-1-ol was isolated as colorless oily liquid.", please change the above sentence as follows:

Compound 5 was identified as Geraniol or (2E)-3,7-dimethylocta-2,6-dien-1-ol isolated as colorless oily liquid.

Our Answer 3:

Thank you for this helpful comment. As requested, we have changed the text accordingly, so it is edited and highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer 1

Comment R1:

The article is very well written, and I think there is no problem, except for a few minor typographical problems:

In the antibacterial test section, Sodomonas is misspelled and Pseudomonas is correct.

Our Answer 1:

Many thanks for your positive feedback and the helpful comments. We have corrected this typographical error throughout the manuscript and highlighted it in yellow.

Comment R2:

The first letter of the plant denominator (vent) must be capital: Vent, in some places not observed.

Our Answer 2:

Thank you for being so considerate and giving helpful comment. We have corrected this error throughout the manuscript.

Reviewer 2

The manuscript titled " Phytochemical Analysis and Biological Activities of Salvia compressa

Vent." is well-presented and well-executed. The conclusion has been justified with the obtained results.

Comment R1:

Before the final acceptance, there are some points to be addressed:
1. Major flaws:
A positive control drug has to be included in the experiments to allow comparisons between the test sample and well-known drugs, particularly in results parts that compare the obtained results.
In the abstract part, please explain more about the control. Is it positive control? Please, name it.

Our Answer 1:

Thank you for taking the time to review our manuscript. We performed the antibacterial test using chloramphenicol as the positive control. we descript it in the experimental: Chloramphenicol was dissolved in DMSO at different concentrations using serial two-fold dilution. Thus, the final concentrations in each distinct 96-well microplate of bacteria were 0.4, 0.2, 0.1, 0.05, 0.025, and 0.0125 mg/mL. The results was modified as: The MIC values were different for each gram-positive or gram-negative bacteria. The MIC values for the gram-negative bacteria including *K. pneumonia*, *E. coli*, *S. typhi*, and *P. aeruginosa* were 0.05, 0.05, 0.05, 0.025 and for the gram-positive bacteria including *Staph. epidermidis*, *Staph. aureus*, and *B. subtilis*, were 0.05, 0.0125 and 0.0125 mg/mL, respectively. On the other hand cisplatin was tested as a reference cytotoxic compound with the IC_{50} average value of 17.0 ±3.4µg/ml against MCF-7 cells. We mentioned the name of both positive controls in the abstract part and highlighted them in blue.

Comment R2:

2. Minor flaws:
Once more, check the grammar. There are grammatical errors.

Our Answer 2:

Thank you for this comment. As suggested, we have checked the whole part of the manuscript in terms of spelling, grammatical and formatting errors, and highlighted the corrections in blue and gray.

Comment R3:

There is no reference for some parts of the methods, such as cell culture.

Our Answer 3:

Thank you for this suggestion. As mentioned, we have added the reference (Firuzi et al 2013) for the cell culture method in the cytotoxicity assay part and updated the references within the text and reference section.

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

The Respected Editor of Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research

Dear Sir,

Many thanks for your kind decision letter regarding our paper: **Phytochemical Analysis and Biological Activities of *Salvia compressa* Vent. ID 127031**
Attached please find the corrected paper according to your reviewer comments as the following table. The corrected points are highlighted in the text. I hope that the paper is now eligible for publication in IJPR.

Comment R1:

1-In page 11 line 232 please correct "Staph. 233 epidermidis, Staph. aureus" as follows:

Staph. 233 epidermidis -> S. epidermidis

Staph. Aureus -> S.aureus

Our Answer 1:

Thank you very much for your comment. We have changed the text as you mentioned here. Now, it is corrected in the manuscript, and the correct information is highlighted in green.

Comment R2:

2- Please use the abbreviated name of journals in the references and correct the references according to the Journal guideline

Our Answer 2:

Thank you for this suggestion. As mentioned, we have abbreviated the name of journals in the references and corrected them according to the Journal guideline within the reference section.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Authors
The reviewers requested some minor corrections in the article.

Our Answer:

Thanks it has been modified accordingly.

Sincerely yours,

Amir Reza Jassbi
Professor of Phytochemistry,
Medicinal and Natural Products Research Center,
Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 11 Aug 2022

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 11 Aug 2022

Dear authors
I have read the revision. All the comments were addressed. I think the manuscript is OK now.