Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products
Volume 17 · Issue 3 · e121624

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparative Evaluation of the Effects of Different Dietary Fibers as Natural Additives on the Shelf Life of Cooked Sausages

Majid Aminzare, Mohammad Hashemi, Asma Afshari, Seyyed Mohammad Ali Noori, Mohammadreza Rezaeigolestani

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Dec 2021	31 Jan 2022	16 Feb 2022	10.5812/jjnpp-121624

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

1 comment · 23 Jan 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 23 Jan 2022

Dear Authors,

The review of your manuscript has arrived. According to the reviewers' comments, major revision is required. The discussion and conclusion sections need significant changes to make them clearer; up-to-date references (references from the last 5 years) are also required.

Please revise the manuscript accordingly, upload the new version with a point-by-point response to the comments, and highlight the changes.

Yours,
JJNPP EIC

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

First of all, we should thank the respected referee for his/her constructive expert opinions and comments. We carefully revised and/or responded to the comments and questions of reviewers point by point as follows:

Reviewer #1comments:

1. 1. The title is too long. The title should be short and concise and contain the main variables of the research and describe the content of the article and be appropriate to the main purpose. If possible title change to below:
   2. "Comparative evaluation of the effects of different dietary fibers as natural additives on the shelf life of cooked sausages".

Revision made: The title has been changed accordingly.

2. Key words change to below.
   Dietary fiber, natural additives, meat products, shelf life, Sensorial, Microbiological analysis.

Revision made: The key words have been changed accordingly.

3. In the abstract section to write Colony-Forming Unit per gram (CFU/g).

Revision made: Revised (line 15)

4. 5. Line 124: The evolution corrected to evaluation.

Revision made: Corrected (line 124).

5. Please ensure that every reference cited in the text is also present in the reference list. References should be adjusted according to the format of the journal, as described below.
   Walker DM, Oghumu S, Gupta G, McGwire BS, Drew ME, Satoskar AR. Mechanisms of cellular invasion by intracellular parasites. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2014; 71(7):1245–63. doi: 10.1007/s00018-013-1491-1. [PubMed: 24221133]. [PubMed Central: PMC4107162].

Revision made: References number 2 and 9 were corrected.

Reviewer #2comments: Best regards

Reviewer 2:
Abstract
Line 10: Can you mention the condition of the storage?

Revision made: Revised (line 11).

Keywords
Line 21: Please write in alphabetical order and change the keyword "Refrigeration storage"

Revision made: Revised.

Introduction
Line 47: Please change the sentence "...tolerance and contributing..." to "...tolerance as well as contributing..."

Revision made: Corrected (lines 47-48).

Line 61: Please put the word "the" before shelf-life.

Revision made: Corrected (line 61).

Materials and methods
Line 72: Table 2 should be Table 1
Revision made: Corrected (line 72).

Line 85: The name of fibers not necessary capital letter

Revision made: To avoid confusion between the “orange fiber” name (**OF**) and “**of**” (preposition), we have kept the capital letter format.

Results
Line 125: Table 1 should be Table 2

Revision made: Corrected (line 125).

Discussion
Line 171: "In this concern, in the present of study..." please remove either one.

Revision made: Revised (line 171).

Line 175: As you mentioned reported in the literature (14). Please add some semntence about that literature.

Revision made: Revised (lines 175-178).

Line 179: Please remove the words "Following our findings" and replace with "Based on our findings

Revision made: Revised (line 182).

Line 183: Please remove the words "in a study"

Revision made: Corrected

Line 196: Please find the reference that up to date (5 years back)

Revision made: Corrected (lines 187-190).

Line 201 - 202: Please rephrase the sentence.

Revision made: Revised (line 205-206).

Conclusion
Line 215: Please rephrase the sentence and check your grammar

Revision made: Revised (lines 217-222).

EIC comments:

The review of your manuscript has arrived. According to the reviewers' comments, major revision is required. The discussion and conclusion sections need significant changes to make them clearer; up-to-date references (references within recent 5 years) are also required.

Revision made: Some up-to-date references have been added (Lines 175-178, 187-190 and 200). The discussion and conclusion parts were revised accordingly.

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 16 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 16 Feb 2022

Dear Authors,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in JJNPP in its current form. We will send it to the publisher for further processing.

Yours faithfully,
JJNPP EIC