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

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.96058
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: 8(4); e96058

Peer Review Report for "A Review on Antibacterial Effects of Iranian Herbal Medicine on Methicillin-Resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*"

Author(s): Masoumeh Baradaran, Amir Jalali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 28 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 4 Oct 2019

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)

30 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the author for submitting the manuscript to this journal. There are some comments in my opinion:
A) Write a running title.
B) Check keywords with MeSH and revise them.
- BACKGROUND
1. Write more about quality of life. (you can use of this article : A comparison of quality of life between adolescences with beta thalassemia major and their healthy peers)
- Evidence Acquisition
1. Please write a structural method. Add some subheadings such as (Search period; Source of information; Search terms; Selection criteria employed).
2. Add a Flow diagram of selected studies . how many studies found? How many deleted? And finally how many selected?
3. Add the Selection criteria employed in your study.
4. You should add a discussion section.
Thank you so much

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thank to the author for sending this manuscript with the title : A review on antibacterial effects of Iranian medicinal herbs on staphylococcus aureus and MRSA, as one of the causes of chronic infections. for review.
I think this manuscript needs some correction before publication.
First of all, it should be organized based on JJCDC guideline. the abstract is not organized. the author should attention to published articles and correct the manuscript.
1- The conclusion of the abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings.
2- Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction and discussion.
3- The design of the study has not explained clearly. Whats is the kind of review? Systematic? Narrative?
4- What was the sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in the study. What are the exclusion criteria?
5- There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.
6- Please mention the limitation and strong points of the study.
7- Is there any novelty in the study? Please describe it in the discussion.
8- Please write about ethical consideration.
Thank you very much.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Thank to the author for submitting the manuscript to JJCDC. This study is interesting in the chronic illness field. Based on our reviewers' comments the article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I recommend the author to revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Sep 2019

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript in JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments your article needs some revisions in all parts of it. I recommend you revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

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.

Hi

Thank you for your comments, reviewers. All you wanted were done.

Reviewer 1:

Q: First of all, it should be organized based on JJCDC guideline. your abstract is not organized. You should attention to published articles and correct your manuscript.
R: The abstract is organized now based on JJCDC guideline.

Q: Conclusion of the abstract is poor. It should be more explanation about your findings.

R: Conclusion of the abstract was changed with more explanation about findings.

Q: Please explain more about the novelty of your article in the introduction and discussion.

R: It was added as final sentences of "context" and "objective" sections (highlighted).

Q: Design of study has not explained clearly. whats is your kind of review? Systematic? Narrative? R: Design of study, kind of review (systematic review) were added to "Data Sources" section of the manuscript and were highlighted.

Q: What was your sampling strategy; it is a critical point for external validity in your study. What are your exclusion criteria?

R: It was added to "Study Selection and data Extraction" section of the manuscript and was highlighted.

Q: There are some spelling and grammatical errors in the text. Please correct them.

R: All spelling and grammatical errors were corrected.

Q: Please mention the limitation and strong points of your study.

R: It was added to end part of "Result" section (highlighted).

Q: Is there any novelty in your study? Please describe it in the discussion.

R:According to JJCDC guideline (http://jjchronic.com/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#systematic_review.html) the full text of a systematic review article doesn't contain "discussion" section. The novelty of this study is describe in the first of "Result" section (highlighted).

Q: Please write about ethical consideration.

R: Research Ethics Committee code (IR.AJUMS.REC.1396.150) was added to "Data Sources" section.

Reviewer 2:

Q: Write a running title.

R: A running title was added: "Antibacterial effects of Iranian herbs on *S. aureus*"

Q: Check keywords with MeSH and revise them

R: Keywords were checked with MeSH and revised.

Q: Write more about quality of life. (you can use of this article: A comparison of quality of life between adolescences with beta thalassemia major and their healthy peers)

R: We wrote about quality of life as you mentioned, and your suggested article was added as the reference (highlighted in context).

Q: Please write a structural method. Add some subheadings such as (Search period; Source of information; Search terms; Selection criteria employed).

R: Search period, Source of information; and Search terms were added in "Data Sources" section. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added to "Study Selection and data Extraction" section.

Q: Add a Flow diagram of selected studies. how many studies found? How many deleted? And finally how many selected?

R: A flow diagram was added as figure 1.

Q: Add Selection criteria employed in your study.

R: Inclusion and exclusion criteria were added to "Study Selection and data Extraction" section.

Q: You should add a discussion section.

R: With respect to your comment, this review article was organized based on JJCDC guideline (http://jjchronic.com/en/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#systematic_review.html). According to JJCDC guideline the full text of a systematic review article contains the below sections: Context, Objective, Data Sources, Study Selection, Data Extraction, Results, Conclusions

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) 4 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
All comments done. But I think the count word of abstract is high. If the publisher has a permit for submission then it will be OK. I suggest before publish the author should reduce the word count in the abstract.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The author should reduce the count of the abstract. however, the journal homepage permits the submission.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.