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.104346
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(2); e104346

Peer Review Report for "Potassium Dichromate-Induced Hepato- and Hematotoxicity in Rats: Nutritive Composition and Ameliorative Role of *Acacia nilotica* L. Leaf"

Author(s): Samuel Akpoyowvare Ejoh, Franklyn Nonso Iheagwam, Afolabi Olakunle Olusola

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 May 2020
Revised Date: 22 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 12 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)

6 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for choosing JJNPP for publishing the manuscript. They should do consider the following modifications:
1- Please add “Haematotoxicity” and “Nutritive Composition” to the “Keywords”.
2- Please change “alanine transaminase” to “alanine aminotransferase” in line 15 of “Abstract”.
3- Please write “Fabaceae” and “Mimosoideae” in Italic form in second line of second paragraph of “Background” section.
4- Please change “anti-Alzheimers” to “anti-Alzheimer’s” in line 11 of second paragraph of “Background” section.
5- You should allude to the “methods” that you performed in the study at “Abstract” section briefly.
6- “Eosinophils and monocytes were not altered ($p<0.05$) by…” is a controversial phrase in 12 lines before “Discussion” section, please correct the significance level.
7- Please correct “fhown” in 5 lines before “Discussion” section.

8- Please add related “significance level” to the end of “Results” section.
9- Please add related original “phytochemical analysis” results to the article.
10- Please add related reference(s) after “problem.” in line 3 of “Discussion” section.
11- Please correct grammar structure of “Triglyceride lipase and unspecific esterase are major enzymes K2Cr2O7 inhibits (8). Also, these abnormalities may be attributed to Cr(IV)-induced hepatic damage since the liver the cholesterol and triglycerides synthesis site.” in page 8.
12- You should explain the “limitations” of the study at “Discussion” section.
13- You should allocate a separate section to “Availability of Data” after “Conflict of Interest” and explain related issues at the section.
14- Reference 20 is not up-to-date, please substitute the reference with up-to-date reference.
Good Luck!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 31 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing the manuscript. Please the authors do consider the following hints;
1- Please write the "P value" in result section.
2- It is better to analyze the relationship between organ chromium retention and liver function by "Acacia nilotica"
3- In discussion: writing about possible effects of "Acacia nilotica" on metal toxicity specially chromium can build a more power discussion.
sincerely yours!

Amir Larki Harchegani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. There are some points that need consideration by the authors.
1. The title of the manuscript should be modified as follows:
Ameliorative Role of "Acacia nilotica L." Leaf. on Potassium Dichromate-induced Hepato- and Haematotoxicity in Rats
2. Why did the authors choose animals of both sexes?
3. The drawn circles in histological figures have no description in the legend. It is basically better to use arrows instead of circles to indicate the type and location of lesions or tissue markers.
Good Luck!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
This article still needs minor revisions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 20 Sep 2020

Dear Authors,

This article still needs 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.

Dear

Editor in Chief, Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products

Find attached the revised version of our Manuscript:

Title: Potassium Dichromate-induced Hepato- and Haematotoxicity in Rats: Nutritive Composition and Ameliorative Role of *Acacia nilotica* L. Leaf.

Submission ID: 104346

Below are the responses made to the reviewer's comments as highlighted in the manuscript:

Reviewers comment	**Response**
Reviewer 1	
Why authors chose treatment in male and female rats not male or female?	Both male and female animals were used for this study because they respond differently to chromium toxicity. This has been attributed to the difference in biochemical makeup. Results obtained will proffer a better view of the effect of any abatement property on both sexes rather than one sex. Previous studies have been done to corroborate this Stout et al (2009). Environmental Health Perspectives, 117(5), 716-722. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0800208), Singh, et al (2016). Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(4), 3914-3924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5622-0 .
Please write P value exact in result section?	Writing the exact P value will make the result section too bulky and monotonous. However, the authors will like to point out that various research report this way. Ogunlana et al. (2020). Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine, 2020. Iheagwam et al.(2020). Oxidative Medicine and Cellular Longevity, 2020.
It is better authors analysis relationship between organ chromium retention and liver function with Acacia nilotica effects.	Done
In discussion possible pathways of Acacia nilotica on metal toxicity special chromium can to build power discussion.	Done
Reviewer 2	
1- Please add "Haematotoxicity" and "Nutritive Composition" to the "Keywords".	Done
2- Please change "alanine transaminase" to "alanine aminotransferase" in line 15 of "Abstract".	Done
3- Please write "Fabaceae" and "Mimosoideae" in Italic form in second line of second paragraph of "Background" section.	Done
4- Please change "anti-Alzheimers" to "anti-Alzheimer's" in line 11 of second paragraph of "Background" section.	Done
5- You should allude to the "methods" that you	Done

performed in the study at “Abstract” section briefly.	
6- “Eosinophils and monocytes were not altered ($p<0.05$) by…” is controversial phrase in 12 lines before “Discussion” section, please correct the significance level.	Done
7- Please correct “fhown” in 5 lines before “Discussion” section.	Done
8- Please add related “significance level” to the end of “Results” section.	Significant has been removes since statistical analysis was not done on the architectural structure
9- Please add related original “phytochemical analysis” results to the article.	It has already been added and corroborated in reference 22 and 23
10- Please add related reference(s) after “problem.” in line 3 of “Discussion” section.	Done
11- Please correct grammar structure of “Triglyceride lipase and unspecific esterase are major enzymes K2Cr2O7 inhibits (8). Also, these abnormalities may be attributed to Cr(IV)-induced hepatic damage since the liver the cholesterol and triglycerides synthesis site.” in page 8.	Done
12- You should explain the “limitations” of the study at “Discussion” section.	Further studies have been recommended to study the limitation of the study
13- You should allocate a separate section to “Availability of Data” after “Conflict of Interest” and explain related issues at the section.	Done
14- Reference 20 is not up-to-date, please substitute the reference with up-to-date reference.	This reference is the benchmark for protein assessment using the phenol method.
Reviewer 3:	
1. The title of the manuscript should be modified as follows:	
Ameliorative Role of Acacia nilotica L. Leaf. on Potassium Dichromate-induced Hepato- and Haematotoxicity in Rats	The authors humbly decline as the title suggested by the reviewer does not capture the nutritive composition of Acacia nilotica L. Leaf.
2. Why did the authors choose animals of both sexes?	Both male and female animals were used for this study because they respond differently to chromium toxicity. This has been attributed to the difference in biochemical makeup. Results obtained will proffer a better view of the effect of any abatement property on both sexes rather than one sex. Previous studies have been done to corroborate this Stout et al (2009). Environmental Health Perspectives, 117(5), 716-722. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.0800208), Singh, et al (2016). Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 23(4), 3914-3924. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5622-0 .
3. In histological figures, circles are drawn that have no description in the figure subtitle. It is basically better to use arrows instead of circles to indicate the type and location of lesions or	Done

tissue markers.	

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) 12 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript has been edited and therefore, it is suitable for publication.
Sincerely yours!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This article is finally accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2020

Dear Authors,
The article is finally accepted.
Thanks.