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.106961
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(2); e106961

# Peer Review Report for "The Protective Effects of Nebulized Nano-Curcumin Against Bleomycin-Induced Pulmonary Fibrosis in Rats"

**Author(s):** Ali Asghar Hemmati, Neda Sistani Karampour, Sedigheh Dahanzadeh, Behzad Sharif Makhmalzadeh, Anahita Rezaie, Mehri Ghafourian

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 12 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 15 Sep 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

**Neda Bavarsad**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Jul 2020

Dear author,
I suggest the manuscript for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 27 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "Effect Of nebulized nano-curcumin on protecting the lung from bleomycin-induced pulmonary fibrosis In rats" requires major revisions by the authors to be appropriate for publishing in JJNPP.

1- The abstract is poorly written. The objective section should describe the main purpose of the study. The method section should contain enough information to enable the reader to understand what was done, and how. The results section should contain as much detail about the findings.
2- The discussion section is poorly written and needs major revision.

Thanks.

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

Dear AE,

As the authors said in the results, nano-curcumin can reduce the TNF contents of lungs which were previously increased by BLM.
Surprisingly, in the abstract, they say that BLM can rarely increase the TNF content of the lungs. Why? These are conflicting!

Thanks

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Aug 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 Aug 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.

Dear reviewer 1

I suggest the manuscript for publication

R:Thank you for your comment.

Dear reviewer 2

1- The abstract is poorly written. The objective section should describe the main purpose of the study. The method section should contain enough information to enable the reader to understand what was done, and how. The results section should contain as much detail about the findings.

2- The discussion section is poorly written and needs major revision

R:Thank you for your comment.I tried to apply changes in abstract and discussion to approving them.

Dear reviewer 3

As you said in the results, nano-curcumin can reduce the TNF contents of lungs which was previously increased by BLM.

Surprisingly, in the abstract you say that, BLM can rarely increase the TNF content of lungs. Why? These are conflicting

R:Thank you for your attention.I corrected it.

**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) 31 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled"Effect Of nebulized nano-curcumin on protecting the lung from bleomycin-induced pulmonary fibrosis In rats" needs minor revision to be suitable for publication in JJNPP.

1- Abstract section needs to be revised: objectives describe what we expect to achieve by a project not the results of the study.

2- In the method (in the abstract section): You should mention which parameter did you evaluate.
3- The results section (abstract) should be written in more detail with P values.

best regards!

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Sep 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) 9 Sep 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 1

1- Abstract section needs to be revised: objectives describe what we expect to achieve by a project not the results of the study.

2- In the method (in abstract section): you should mention which parameter did you evaluated.

3- The results section (abstract) should be written in more details with P values

R:Thank you for your comment.I tried to apply changes in abstract to approving it.

**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.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 13 Sep 2020

Dear AE,

The manuscript entitled " Effect Of nebulized nano-curcumin on protecting the lung from bleomycin-induced pulmonary fibrosis In rats" is acceptable for publication in JJNPP.

Best regards

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 14 Sep 2020

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

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Sep 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.