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-162611
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 20(3) ; e162611

Peer Review Report for "Gastroprotective Effect of Oral Powder Containing Probiotic Metabolites on Indomethacin-Induced Gastric Ulcers in Rats"

Author(s): Afrooz Saadatzadeh, Neda SistaniKarampour, Anahita Rezaei, Saeed Najdbasiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 May 2025
Revised Date:	27 Jun 2025
Accepted Date:	30 Jun 2025

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

17 May 2025

respectfully,
1-limitation should be considered and generalization of finding may be limited due to low sample size .
2-calculation of sample size
3-specify the exact p value e.g. 0.034
4-suggestion for similar further study
5-conclusion should be further clarified
6.study method shoulde be further explained.

Esmaeil Mohammadian : Reviewer

18 May 2025

Dear Editor
Have a nice day.
The author studied Gastroprotective effect of Oral Powder Containing Probiotic Metabolites on Indomethacin- Induced gastric ulcers in Rats.
I would suggest reconsidering the manuscript for publication only after the following major revision. It should be completely restructured to be published.
1. Correct the grammatical error.
2. Figure 1 is unclear
3. Write a more complete conclusion.
4. Explain more about the importance of prebiotics.
5. Report the results in a table with SD values.
6. Further investigate the proposed mechanism.

REFEREE : Reviewer

21 May 2025

Please revise the whole text writing style. In whole text probiotics name should be write with same manner with italic form.
Some words like IL-6, TNF-α in first time should write with full name or illustrated in abbreviations.
The introduction should revised and the novelty of your work was added.
Please rewrite the whole text with same font, some words have bold type .
The subtitled in material and method and result section should be added in revised manuscript.
Some words like CMC should be revised with full name in figure captions.

REFEREE : Reviewer

24 May 2025

Dear colleague;
The research article needs two minor correction to be accepted;
1- The result part of the abstract dose not make any sense, thus please rewrite it.
2- The Legends of figures are not well explained. They should be rewritten.

Regards!

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.

Reviewer 1:

Response to the questions of the first reviewer

Corrections were made to the text

1-Please revise the whole text writing style. In whole text probiotics name should be write with same manner with italic form.

Done

2-Some words like IL-6, TNF-α in first time should write with full name or illustrated in abbreviations

Done

3-The introduction should revised and the novelty of your work was added.

Done

4-Please rewrite the whole text with same font, some words have bold type .

Done

5-The subtitled in material and method and result section should be added in revised manuscript.

Done

6-Some words like CMC should be revised with full name in figure caption

Done

.

Reviewer 2:

Response to the questions of the Second reviewer

1- The result part of the abstract dose not make any sense, thus please rewrite it.

The results were rewritten. Corrections were made to the text

2- The Legends of figures are not well explained. They should be rewritten.

The above case has been corrected

Reviewer 3:

1-limitation should be considered and generalization of finding may be limited due to low sample size .

It has been corrected in the text and referred to

2-calculation of sample size

It was conducted and established in accordance with the references.
3-specify the exact p value e.g. 0.034

It is mentioned in the text ($p < 0.05$)
4-suggestion for similar further study

It has been corrected in the text
5-conclusion should be further clarified

It has been corrected in the text
6.study method shoulde be further explained.

It has been corrected in the text

Reviewer 4:

1. Correct the grammatical error.

It has been corrected in the text
2. Figure 1 is unclear

It has been corrected
3. Write a more complete conclusion.

Done
4. Explain more about the importance of prebiotics.

Done
5. Report the results in a table with SD values.

It is presented in the chart
6. Further investigate the proposed mechanism

It is presented in the

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 31 May 2025

respectfully,
conclusion to be further explained with respect to study limitaions

Esmaeil Mohammadian : Reviewer — 2 Jun 2025

Dear Editor
Have a nice day.
The author investigated “Gastroprotective effect of Oral Powder Containing Probiotic Metabolites on Indomethacin- Induced gastric ulcers in Rats”.
In my opinion, this manuscript cannot be considered for publication.

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.

In the name of God

Reviewer 1:

Response to the questions of the First reviewer:

Thank you for your opinion, esteemed referee.

The topic of probiotics as a natural substance appears to be well aligned with the the journal's scope.

Reviewer 2:

Response to the questions of the second reviewer:

conclusion to be further explained with respect to study limitaions;:

The point raised by the respected reviewer has been addressed..

However, limitations as, further studies on animal models and humans are needed to confirm this hypothesis. Additionally, long-term administration of oral dosage forms contain probiotic metabolites and probably indications in human studies should be performed. Also toxicity parameters must be evaluated.

Reviewer 3:

Response to the questions of the third reviewer:

Thank you for your opinion, esteemed referee.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Narjes Zaeemzadeh : Reviewer — 29 Jun 2025

Dear EIC;

All the reviewers' comments were considered well.
Accepted for publish in this step.

Regards

REFEREE : Reviewer — 30 Jun 2025

In this manuscript all comments were corrected and can be published with this version.