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

Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcmb.110309
Published in: Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology: 11(4); e110309

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Hydro-Alcoholic Extract of *Ocimum basilicum* on $CaCl_2$-Induced Cardiac Arrhythmias in Rats"

Author(s): Mohammad Kheradmandpour, Seyed Abolfazl Aminifar, Mahin Dianat

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 14 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Oct 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) 13 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This is an interesting experimental study in which the authors explored the potential protective effects of Ocimum basilicum on CaCl2 Induced Cardiac Arrhythmia model, which may give insight into understanding the cardio-protective properties of herbal drugs as an alternative agent with low side effects. However, there are some points that need to be improved by the authors, since they present inaccuracies or omissions.
• MDA and SOD in Abstract and Material and method section: In addition to the abbreviation, the whole phrase should also be used.
• The authors need to cite more literature to support the description of the function of Ocimum basilicum.
• In the discussion, please expound upon the manuscript's limitations.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 13 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript evaluates the preventive effect of extract of OB, a plant from the mint

family, on arrhythmias in rats. Following notes should be considered in the manuscript to be prepared for possible publication in the journal:

1. English has to be revised in the whole manuscript.
2. The quality of histopathological images has to be improved for better comparison.

Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,

Minor revision is recommended.

Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,

The following corrections must be performed before getting acceptance

1. The ethical approval must be mention in Method
2. Is there any voucher no. of the studied plant/extract? if so, mention it
3. Groups names are not clear on the x-axis of the figures
4. The Legend of the histopathological image should be added

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.

Date: 14.10.2020

Subject: **Resubmission of a manuscript**

Dear Editor,

I am enclosing here with a manuscript entitled "Evaluation of Effect of Hydro-alcoholic Extract of *Ocimum basilicum* on $CaCl_2$ Induced Cardiac Arrhythmias in Rats" for publication at "**Jentashapir Journal of Cellular and Molecular Biology**" for possible evaluation.

With the resubmission of this manuscript (ID: **110309**) I should mention that:

Response to reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

Comment 1:

• MDA and SOD in Abstract and Material and method section: In addition to the abbreviation, the whole phrase should also be used.

Response *1:*

Thank you for accurate comment, appropriate changes have been made in the *Abstract and Material and method section***.** The mention items highlighted with blue color.

Comment 2: *The authors need to cite more literature to support the description of the function of Ocimum basilicum.*

Response 2: Appropriate changes have been made in **Manuscript.**

Comment 3: *In the discussion, please expound upon the manuscripts limitations.*

Response 3: Appropriate changes have been made in **the** *discussion section.*

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: *English has to be revised in whole manuscript.*

Response *1*: This Manuscript has been improved by a professional language editing service and the article is edited in grammar and spell mistakes. The mention items highlighted with green color.

Comment 2: *The quality of histopathological images has to be improved for better comparison.*

Response 2: Appropriate changes have been made.

EIC Decision:

1. The ethical approval must be mention in Method.

Response*:* The mention items highlighted with blue color.

2. Is there any voucher no. of the studied plant/extract? if so, mention it.

Response*: Unfortunately we have not it.*

3. Groups names are not clear in x-axis of the figures.

Response*: It is done.*

4. The Legend of histopathological image should be added.

Response: The mention items highlighted with blue color.

Sincerely,

Dr. Mahin Dianat

Assistant Professor

Department of Physiology

Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences

Ahvaz

Iran

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) 14 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
The requested corrections was done and It is now ready for final approval.
Thank you to give me chance to collaborate with your valuable journal.
Thanks.

Seyyed Ali Mard: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Oct 2020

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

Seyyed Ali Mard: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Oct 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.