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.14505
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(1); e14505

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Cinnamon on Inflammatory Factors, Pain and Anthropometric Indices in Progressive-relapsing Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Elham Delaviz, Moosa Salehi, Afsane Ahmadi, Mohammad Fararooei, Mahdis Vakili, Nahid Ashjazadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Jul 2017
Revised Date: 7 Jan 2019
Accepted Date: 18 Feb 2019

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)

8 Oct 2017

Comments on manuscript entitled “The Effect of Cinnamon on Inflammatory Factors, Pain and
Anthropometric Indices in Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial.

There some grammatical and topographic errors in this manuscript the need to eliminate by a native English linguistic.
Method: please provide a formula for sample size calculation.
Methods: Authors should provide more information about how they exactly prepared cinnamon capsules?
Please state that if capsules differed regarding smell and how the study was single blind. It was possible that someone else distributed capsules and placebo among participants and the researchers remained blinded.
I do not agree with using cinnamon powder in the title or discussion section, as authors used capsules not powder.
The method of randomization is not clear and what did author about allocation

concealment?

What was the logic of using 2 gr cinnamons per day? Did you have any reference?

Statistical analyses: if you measured pain or other variables every two weeks, you need to use proper statistical test such as Repeated Measure test.

How the authors measured “intention to treat” in this study?

Because 9 and 10 participants dropped-out, authors should test differences between drop-out people and non-drop-out participants and Table 1 should include information about all recruited people (including drop-out participants).

Authors did not mention to write about body mass index in the method section, however, in the result section they reported BMI.

Table 1: please separate diploma from university education.

Table 2: there is no need to report the Height of participants.

Results: authors should mention the side effects of cinnamon or placebo.

In this study authors measured food intake of participants. What was the logic for this measurement? And it is clear that the intake of energy, carbohydrate and protein decreased in the intervention group compared to the control group, while the fat intake was increased non-significantly in the intervention group. I am just wondering, was it necessary to measure food intake of participants? And now so what? with the different decrease and increase in the food items? Did authors want to conclude that they excluded the effect of different food item on pain and other variables?

Limitation of study: authors should investigate the power of study after drop-out and if decreased, mention in this section.

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 to the Editor

journal:	Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products
Manuscript ID:	14505
Title:	The Effect of Cinnamon on Inflammatory Factors, Pain and Anthropometric Indices in Multiple Sclerosis Patients: A Randomized Controlled Trial

Dear Editor

Many thanks as you checked my article carefully. I did my best to provide appropriate explanations for your questions. I hope you will be satisfied with answers.

Reviewer 1:

1- *- Title should better reflect the content. You have done your research in a specific group of MS patients and it will be more informative to be mentioned*

Reply: The title was changed in order to be specific and accurate.

2- KEYWORDS is not MeSH.

Reply: Keywords been cheked with MeSH and all are fixed.

3- Introduction section is well-written with some minor grammatical errors that should be corrected. It would better modify and reference this sentence "Multiple sclerosis (MS) is the most disabling neurological disease and has……"

Reply: *the introduction was modified and edited.*

Reviewer 2:

1- There some grammatical and topographic errors in this manuscript the need to eliminate by a native English linguistic:

Reply: it was rechecked by a native speaker.
2- Method: please provide a formula for sample size calculation.

Reply: The formula for sample size is not currently available.
3- Methods: Authors should provide more information about how they exactly prepared cinnamon capsules?
Please state that if capsules differed regarding smell and how the study was single blind. It was possible that someone else distributed capsules and placebo among participants and the researchers remained blinded.

Reply: Extensive description about prepairing the capsules were added to the text (highlighted).

While it was possible to conduct this study as a double blind or triple blind study but based on personal decisions, the research team decided to perform it in single-blind way.

4- I do not agree with using cinnamon powder in the title or discussion section, as authors used capsules not powder.

Reply: The word "powder" was eliminated in these two places.

5- The method of randomization is not clear and what did author about allocation concealment?

Reply: the sequentially concealed counter was used as the allocation concealment method.

6- What was the logic of using 2 gr cinnamons per day? Did you have any reference?

Reply: this amount of cinnamon was usd based on the expert oppion of the researcher.

7- Statistical analyses: if you measured pain or other variables every two weeks, you need to use proper statistical test such as Repeated Measure test.

Reply: The method of statistical analysis was selected based on the statistic expert of the university.

8-How the authors measured "intention to treat" in this study?

Reply: we did not measure intention to treat

9-Because 9 and 10 participants dropped-out, authors should test differences between drop-out people and non-drop-out participants and Table 1 should include information about all recruited people (including drop-out participants).

Reply: table one was corrected

10-Authors did not mention to write about body mass index in the method section, however, in the result section they reported BMI.

Reply:it was fixed
11-Table 1: please separate diploma from university education.
Table 2: there is no need to report the Height of participants.

Reply:the table was edited

12-Results: authors should mention the side effects of cinnamon or placebo.

Reply:they were mentioned
13-In this study authors measured food intake of participants. What was the logic for this measurement?

Reply:to have a background about their diet.

14-And it is clear that the intake of energy, carbohydrate and protein decreased in the intervention group compared to the control group, while the fat intake was increased non-significantly in the intervention group. I am just wondering, was it necessary to measure food intake of participants? And now so what? with the different decrease and increase in the food items? Did authors want to conclude that they excluded the effect of different food item on pain and other variables?

Reply:yes
15-Limitation of study: authors should investigate the power of study after drop-out and if decreased, mention in this section.

Reply: the writer of this paper did not measure the parameters after drop-out.

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.