

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 "[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:

[Peer Review](#)



Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/jjnpp-161641>

Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 20(2) ; e161641

Peer Review Report for "Chemical Composition, Antibacterial and Antioxidant Activity of *Trachyspermum copticum*, *Cuminum cyminum* and *Heracleum persicum* Essential Oils"

Author(s): Alireza Alvani, Zeinab Mazarei, Babak Mokhtari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Apr 2025
Revised Date:	4 May 2025
Accepted Date:	13 May 2025

Revision (0)

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

Esmail Mohammadian : Reviewer

6 Apr 2025

Dear Editor

Have a nice day.

The author investigated Chemical composition, antibacterial and antioxidant activity of *Trachyspermum copticum*, *Cuminum cyminum* and *Heracleum persicum* essential oils.

I would suggest reconsidering the manuscript for publication only after the following major revision.

1. Please revise the manuscript for lingual quality and typo mistakes.
2. What are the similarities between the oils examined in this study?

3. All values should be reported with SD.
4. Experimental procedures should be based on valid references.
5. What is the novelty of the present study?
6. It is necessary to report the results obtained with graphs.

REFeree : Reviewer

16 Apr 2025

1. Please capitalise the words (except "and" and "of") in the title.
2. The manuscript should be revised linguistically by an editor with full professional proficiency.
3. Please mention the novel features of your study in the introduction.
4. In introduction discussion, please provide a summary of previous related studies on these plants essential oils if there is any, otherwise please highlight this article is the pioneer in this field in the introduction.
5. In case you have used a control for antibiotic activity assay, please include the process and the results in the materials and methods and results sections respectively.
6. In paragraph 2.1, please mention the source of bacterial strains, growth media and all the solvents used in this research.
7. Please add the title "figure 1" to the final page.
8. Please include more previous related studies in discussion if there is any, otherwise emphasise your work novelty.

REFeree : Associate Editor

21 Apr 2025

Dear Authors,

We have received the reports from our reviewers on your manuscript, "Chemical composition, antibacterial and antioxidant activity of *Trachyspermum copticum*, *Cuminum cyminum* and *Heracleum persicum* essential oils ", which you submitted to Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products.

Based on the advice received, we have decided that your manuscript could be reconsidered for publication should you be prepared for major revisions. When preparing your revised manuscript, you are asked to carefully consider the reviewers' comments, and submit a list of responses to the comments. Please, all changes in the revised manuscript be highlighted in yellow color to be detectable by reviewers.

With kind regards,
Associate Editor

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

It was a pleasure receiving the reviewer's comments about the manuscript entitled "Chemical composition, antibacterial and antioxidant activity of *Trachyspermum copticum*, *Cuminum cyminum* and *Heracleum persicum* essential oils" (Manuscript ID: 161641). All the referee's comments were considered carefully one by one and here are point-by-point responses to reviewers' comments.

Reviewer 1:

1. Please capitalize the words (except "and" and "of") in the title.

Response: The words were capitalized in the title.

2. The manuscript should be revised linguistically by an editor with full professional proficiency.

Response: The manuscript was revised for lingual quality.

3. Please mention the novel features of your study in the introduction.

Response: The relevant explanation was added to the objectives section of the article.

4. In introduction discussion, please provide a summary of previous related studies on these plants essential oils if there is any, otherwise please highlight this article is the pioneer in this field in the introduction.

Response: The introduction briefly outlines the established biological properties of each essential oil, accompanied by relevant references.

5. In case you have used a control for antibiotic activity assay, please include the process and the results in the materials and methods and results sections respectively.

Response: This study did not utilize antibiotics, focusing solely on a general evaluation of the antibacterial properties of essential oils. Nevertheless, when comparing the antibacterial efficacy of essential oils to that of antibiotics like Cefixime, as demonstrated in prior research, it is evident that essential oils possess a weaker antibacterial effect than antibiotics.

6. In paragraph 2.1, please mention the source of bacterial strains, growth media and all the solvents used in this research.

Response: The source of bacterial strains, growth medium and solvents were added to section 2.1.

7. Please add the title "figure 1" to the final page.

Response: The title Figure 1 was added to the final page.

8. Please include more previous related studies in discussion if there is any, otherwise emphasise your work novelty.

Response: Additional details regarding prior research have been incorporated into the discussion section of the article.

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor

Have a nice day.

The author investigated Chemical composition, antibacterial and antioxidant activity of *Trachyspermum copticum*, *Cuminum cyminum* and *Heracleum persicum* essential oils.

I would suggest reconsidering the manuscript for publication only after the following major revision.

1. Please revise the manuscript for lingual quality and typo mistakes.

Response: The manuscript was revised for lingual quality.

2. What are the similarities between the oils examined in this study?

Response: These three remarkable species are members of the prestigious Apiaceae family, recognized for their phylogenetic value. Each plant is fragrant and is used both as a spice and for its healing properties in traditional medicine. However, the essential oils derived from these species may differ in their phytochemical compositions.

3. All values should be reported with SD.

Response: IC₅₀ values obtained from the antioxidant assay are the average of three replicates and are accompanied by standard deviation (SD). An analysis of comparable articles indicates that the antibacterial test outcomes in this article align with the presentation manner of results found in other similar studies.

4. Experimental procedures should be based on valid references.

Response: Correlated references were cited in sections 2.4 and 2.5.

5. What is the novelty of the present study?

Response: The relevant explanation was added to the objectives section of the article.

6. It is necessary to report the results obtained with graphs.

Response: The antioxidant test results were presented in the form of graph (Figure 2).

The outcomes of antimicrobial evaluations, which determine the Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) and Minimum Bactericidal Concentration (MBC), are elegantly displayed in a tabular format.

All corrections were made in the main text and the changes highlighted.

Thank you for reconsidering our manuscript.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Esmail Mohammadian : Reviewer

9 May 2025

Dear Editor

Have a nice day.

The addressed issues and concerns have been effectively resolved. Consequently, the reviewer concurs to proceed with the publication of this paper in its current state.