Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products
Volume 19 · Issue 1 · e143074

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) Intake Improves Lipid Profile and Liver Transaminases in Pre-diabetic Adults: A Randomized Double-blinded Trial

Mohammad Reza Afsharmanesh, Azad Reza Mansourian, Marie saghaeian Jazi, Saba Ghaffary, Samira Eshghinia, Nasser Behnampour, Seyyed Mehdi Jafari

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Nov 2023	27 Dec 2023	27 Dec 2023	10.5812/jjnpp-143074

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** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

2 comments · 21 Nov 2023 – 29 Nov 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 21 Nov 2023

1. Has the herbarium code been received for the plant? What authority identified the medicinal plant?
2. There are grammatical mistakes in the text. It is suggested that the text of the article be rechecked for grammatical errors.
3. What was the FPG level of the two groups of patients at the end of the study?
4. Provide information about the average age and gender of the two groups as well as the FPG level of the patients at the beginning and end of the study in a table.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 29 Nov 2023

Dear Dr. Jafari
Your manuscript entitled “Okra (Abelmoschus esculentus) intake improves lipid profile and liver transaminases in pre-diabetic adults: a randomized double blinded trial”, which you submitted to the JJNPP, has been reviewed by reviewers and editors, who suggested major revision. The comments of the reviewer(s) are included at the bottom of this letter. Please revise the manuscript according to the comments.
With regards
Neda Bavarsad
1. Has a herbarium code been obtained for the plant? What authority identified the medicinal plant?
2. There are grammatical mistakes in the text. It is suggested to recheck the text of the article in terms of grammar.
3. What were the FPG levels of the two groups of patients at the end of the study?
4. Provide information about the average age and gender of the two groups as well as the FPG levels of the patients at the beginning and end of the study in a table.

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.

Dear Prof Masood Fereidoonnezhad

Editor in Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript with Submission **ID 143074** entitled “Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) intake improves lipid profile and liver transaminases in pre-diabetic adults: a randomized double blinded trial. We also express our thanks to the reviewers for their comments. All changes have been made according to the comments and the altered areas of the manuscript have been highlighted in yellow color. The answers are as follow:

Regards Dr. J.

Reviewer Comment:

Reviewer 1:

1. Is the herbarium code received for the plant? What authority identified the Medicinal plant?

Reply to comment: The plant was deposited in herbarium of Tabriz University of Medical Science with voucher number 5001 TBZFPH. It was added in revised manuscript.

2. There are grammatical mistakes in the text. It is suggested to re-check the text of the article in terms of grammar.

Reply to comment: it was revised

3. What was the FPG level of the two groups of patients at the end of the study?

Reply to comment: Regarding that the results of FPG end of the study has been placed in another project, therefore the results are not reported in this manuscript.

4. Provide information about the average age and gender of the two groups as well as the FPG level of the patients at the beginning and end of the study in a table.

Reply to comment: Information about the average age and gender of the two groups as well as the FPG level of the patients at the beginning were added in revised manuscript in table 1. Regarding that the results of FPG end of the study has been placed in another project, therefore the results are not reported in this manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

The above article is approved in terms of writing style, study group and study method (techniques, etc.).

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 25 Dec 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 25 Dec 2023

accept

3

Revision 2

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.

Dear Prof Masood Fereidoonnezhad

Editor in Chief of Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript with Submission **ID 143074** entitled “Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus*) intake improves lipid profile and liver transaminases in pre-diabetic adults: a randomized double blinded trial. We also express our thanks to the reviewers for their comments. All changes have been made according to the comments and the altered areas of the manuscript have been highlighted in yellow color. The answers are as follow:

Regards Dr. Jafari

Comment:

1. In Table 1-4, please pay more attention to Standard deviation. The significant number in data and SD should be the same. For example: 4.81± 1 should be corrected as 4.81± 1.00. in Table 1 116.26±602?

Reply to comment: it was revised.

3 Revision 2

0 comments

No public comments in this round.