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.102434
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(3); e102434

Peer Review Report for "The Trend of Scientific Productions on the Use of Herbal Medicines in Metabolic Disorders in the Middle East Countries"

Author(s): Ozra Tabatabaei-Malazy, Shekoufeh Nikfar, Mohammad Abdollahi, Bagher Larijani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 10 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 21 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) — 24 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Native English editing is needed.
2. 2. The title should be changed as follow: Scientific productions' trend of herbal medicines in metabolic disorders treatment in Middle East countries.
3. significance level (p-value) is not pointed in the material and method section
4. In figure 1, lines should be illustrated with symbols such as circles, square,...
5. In figures 1, 2, significance should illustrate with star symbols and in the caption of figures, the p-value should be mentioned.
Thanks.

Mohammad Taghi Goodarzi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 31 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This article is designed and written properly. I recommend it to be published in this form.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
It is recommended that authors review the new articles by 2020. Anyway, this is an interesting manuscript and is appropriate for publishing in the JJNPP.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 7 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This article needs minor revisions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
This article needs major revisions.
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.

Response letter

Dear Editor

Thanks for your comments. Our response to the reviewer's comments is as follows. We hope it is satisfied with you and the reviewers.

Reviewer 1:

1. Native English editing is needed

Response:

Thanks for your comments. English editing is considered. Besides, all changes are highlighted.

2. The title should be changed as follow: Scientific productions' trend of herbal medicines in metabolic disorders treatment in Middle East countries

Response:

The title and running titles are adjusted based on your request.

3. Significance level (p-value) is not pointed in the material and method section

Response:

Your comment is considered.

4. In figure 1, lines should be illustrated with symbols such as circle, square,...

Response:

Your comment is considered.

5. In figures 1, 2, significance should illustrate with star symbols, and in the caption of figures, the p-value should be mention.

Response:

In these figures is just estimated percent of "documents per each year". On other words, the reported peaks are obtained based on "observed frequencies" not based on "statistical analysis". Also, in the main text is emphasized "highest number". It means the peak is not equal to significance. Moreover, we searched in other scientometric studies, and we did not find any reporting of p-value in this regard.

Reviewer 2:

This article is designed and written properly. I recommend it to be published in this form.

Response:

Thanks a lot for your support.

Reviewer 3:

It is recommended that the authors review the new articles by 2020.

Response:

That is a good idea. As you know, following the rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic after March 2020, most recently published papers have focused on this topic. Therefore, we face a tremendous bias to estimate the frequency of related documents to our studied field. It is appreciated to ignore continuing study for the published papers during the COVID pandemic.

Anyway, this is an interesting manuscript and is appropriate for publishing in the JJNPP.

Response:

Thanks a lot for your support.

Sincerely,

Authors

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.

mojtaba rashidi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 20 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
According to the corrections, the article is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This article is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
This article is finally accepted.
Thanks.