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 Natural Pharmaceutical Products
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjnpp.101957
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(2); e101957

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Quercetin on the Gene Expression of Arginine Metabolism Key Enzymes in Human Embryonic Kidney 293 Cells"

Author(s): Saleh Jamehdor, Shirin Farivar, Mohammad Hossein Sangtarash, Razieh Amini, Sara Pajouhanfar, Ali Teimoori

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 4 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 28 Jul 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)

16 Mar 2020

Dear author,
Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. There are some major problems with your MS which unfortunately lead us to reject it:

1- What were your basis and reason(s) to consider “57.5 and 115 µM quercetin” for your methodological procedures???!!!!

2- Why you performed MTT assay only at one time (24 h)????!!!!
MTT assay time course usually consider from 24 to 72 h and in some cases 96 h to obtain optimum IC50. Considering only one time for the issue leads to unreliable results.

3- There is not any figure or diagram regarding the MTT assay results and calculation of IC50 at your results section!!!!

4- You did not allude to exact IC50 concentration at “results” section while this is the main finding that derive from MTT assay!!!

5- You should re-write “Discussion” section with sufficient literature review and compare findings of your investigation with other previous similar studies about the matter.

6- Figure 1. does not have appropriate “legend” descriptions, especially regarding the “statistical” point of view.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Apr 2020

Dear author,
Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript.
1. The presence of plagiarism was evaluated by a variety of plagiarism checker tools. there is not any plagiarism in this manuscript.
2. The analysis method and techniques were applied in this manuscript is suitable and efficient.
3. The results were obtained from this manuscript are valid enough.
4. The referencing and citations were performed correctly in this manuscript.
5. English writing of the manuscript is correct and very fluent.
6. The decision about this manuscript: ACCEPT.
Thanks.

Asadollah Salarabadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Apr 2020

Dear author,
Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. This paper discusses on effects of quercetin flavonoid on arginine metabolism in HEK293 cells. The main contribution of the paper is to provide herbal medicine for cancer treatment.
I recommend that this paper be accepted after major revisions by the authors:
Major comments:
1. Abstract:
The abstract does not have a structure. (Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions)
The word counts for this part should be 250-350 words.
2. Material and methods:
Please explain in the text that why did you consider these two concentrations of quercetin (57.5 and 115 µM)? it is not clear!
3. Footnotes:
Please provide Conflict of Interest, Financial Disclosure, Funding/Support footnotes based on the journal instruction page.
4. References:
The references no. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 46, 47, 48, and 51 should be replaced with the references for the last five years.
Minor comments:
1. Title:
Please add “The” at the beginning of the title: The relation between …
2. Figure:
Figure 1 is not referred to in the text.

for a better understanding, you should use another diagrams for the results section.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

27 Apr 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)

6 May 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.

Reviewer 1:

1. For quercetin, a concentration of 2.5 µmol to 1.2 mmol was tested for MTT and continued for 72 hours. In these quercetin concentrations, we did not see any toxic effects. Since it was not possible to make stock with more than this concentration, we chose 115 and 57.5 µmol.

2. The MTT section was added to the results, and legend and statistical view point were added to the chart subtitle.

3. Regarding the discussion, it is the best to find new sources for rewriting this section, but due to the novelty of the research, there were only a few sources in this case for Quercetin. A new one has also been added.

Reiewer 2:

1. Abstract updated according to Magazine format.

2. The reasons for using two concentrations of 57.5 and 115 micromoles in this study were explained in the results section.

3. Foot notes were modified according to the magazine format.

4. References 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 18, 20, 21, 23, 23 and 24 were changed, but we couldn’t change 26, 28, 29, 30, 30, 46, 47, 48 and 51 References because the principles They're studying this, and we haven't found any alternatives to them, we haven't been able to update them.

5. "The" was added to the beginning of the title.

6. The diagram was changed in the result section.

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.

Asadollah Salarabadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 25 May 2020

Dear authors,

I have checked the authors' comments and the revised parts. In my opinion, all revised parts are appropriate except the "Footnotes" section.
- They should write meaningful and with complete sentences for the "Funding/Support" section. Do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".

I recommend that this paper be accepted after minor revision.

Kind Regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 30 May 2020

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) 28 Jun 2020

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 Reviewer:

I wrote meaningful and completed sentences for the "Funding/Support" section.

With best regards

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.

Asadollah Salarabadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 17 Jul 2020

Dear AE,

I reviewed the amendments and in my opinion, this article is acceptable.

With respect,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 22 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 28 Jul 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.