

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-166550>

Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 20(4) ; e166550

Peer Review Report for "Investigating the Protective Role of *Quercus brantii* Extract on HT29 Cell Viability Following Ionizing Radiation Exposure"

Author(s): Amir Siahpoosh, Alireza Doroudi, Zahra Zانبوري, Mohammad Javad Tahmasebi, Mohammad Rashno, Reza Totonchian, Narges Atefipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	22 Sep 2025
Revised Date:	21 Oct 2025
Accepted Date:	22 Oct 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

22 Sep 2025

Dear Editor,

The manuscript entitled "Investigating the Protective Role of *Quercus brantii* Extract on HT29 Cell Viability Following Ionizing Radiation Exposure" was reviewed as follows:

1- In general, the methods section is not well written and clearly written, for example, without mentioning the optimal radiation doses and extract doses or the optimal time prior to exposure to radiation, the evaluation of the research under optimal conditions is immediately stated, which is confusing. It is better to revise

these sections and first provide a summary of the method used, as in the paragraph at the bottom of page 11.

2-In Table 1, the numbers are expressed as two decimal places. The percentage of survival cells was calculated by dividing the absorbance of treated cells by control cells should be removed from the table title and move it below.

3- Explanations such as "The survival percentages are expressed as means $\pm$ SD. *** $P < 0.001$ Extract+Radiation group Vs. Radiation group" are removed from the figures titles and moved to the bottom of the figures.

REFEREE : Reviewer

22 Sep 2025

Given that the accuracy of the data is crucial for a manuscript, I must emphasize that Figures 1, 2, 4, and 5 were not analyzed using SPSS statistical software, and therefore, the results cannot be considered reliable or trustworthy. The text indicates that the results were analyzed with SPSS.

REFEREE : Reviewer

30 Sep 2025

The study highlights the plant's antioxidant properties and its potential as a natural radioprotector. The authors have systematically assessed the dose, timing, and concentration effects of the extract, providing an in-depth evaluation of its radioprotective efficacy. The manuscript is well-structured, with clear objectives, detailed methodology, and comprehensive statistical analysis.

Suggestions for Improvement:

- 1- Revise sections for grammatical accuracy and fluency.
- 2- Provide detailed figure legends and expand statistical descriptions (e.g., include sample size and error bars).
- 3- Compare Q. brantii radioprotective effects with other natural compounds and synthetic agents.
- 4- Investigate unique properties of Q. brantii that differentiate it from other radioprotective agents.

REFEREE : Reviewer

1 Oct 2025

Dear Author

The research conducted is purposeful and valuable.

However, it has some flaws that can be corrected for publication.

The scientific name of the plant is, in many cases, grammatically incorrect. Please correct it.

Please reference the following articles and use them in the conclusion section.

1. Quercus brantii gall alcoholic extract induces apoptosis by suppressing EGFR/HER2 signaling in human breast cancer cells
2. Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Quercus and Other Health Benefits
3. Oak (Quercus brantii): an overview

4. A Comprehensive Review of Phytochemistry and Biological Activities of Quercus Species

What is the reason for using the whole extract in this study?

REFEREE : Associate Editor

2 Oct 2025

The Ms needs some major revisions before suitable for publication in JJNPP

REFEREE : EIC

3 Oct 2025

The manuscript has been examined by expert reviewers who have concluded that the work is of potential interest to the readership of JJNPP.

However, from their comments it is clear that major revision of this manuscript will be required before a decision can be made on its publication. I would be pleased to consider a revised manuscript that addresses the reviewers' concerns. Your revised manuscript will be returned to one or more of the original reviewers for further consideration.

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.

Date: 07.10.2025**Dear Editor,**

Thank you for your valuable feedback on our manuscript, "Investigating the Protective Role of Quercus brantii Extract on HT29 Cell Viability Following Ionizing Radiation Exposure" (Manuscript ID: 166550). We appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to evaluating our work. We have carefully considered the comments and suggestions and made the following revisions:

Reviewer 1:

Comment 1: In general, the methods section is not well written and clearly written, for example, without mentioning the optimal radiation doses and extract doses or the optimal time prior to exposure to radiation, the evaluation of the research under optimal conditions is immediately stated, which is confusing. It is better to revise these sections and first provide a summary of the method used, as in the paragraph at the bottom of page 11.

Response 1: Thank you for your valuable feedback regarding the methods section of my manuscript. I revised the methods section. I appreciate your insights, and I believe these revisions will improve the overall quality of the manuscript.

Comment 2: In Table 1, the numbers are expressed as two decimal places. The percentage of survival cells was calculated by dividing the absorbance of treated cells by control cells should be removed from the table title and move it below.

Response 2: Thank you for your insightful feedback on my manuscript. I made the necessary revisions to Table 1.

Comment 3: Explanations such as "The survival percentages are expressed as means $\pm$ SD. *** $P < 0.001$ Extract+Radiation group Vs. Radiation group" are removed from the figures titles and moved to the bottom of the figures.

Response 3: Thank you for your feedback regarding the figures in my manuscript. I have removed the explanatory details from the figure titles and included them in a separate document that has

been submitted along with the figures. This adjustment aligns with your suggestions and improves clarity.

Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: Revise sections for grammatical accuracy and fluency.

Response 1: Thank you for your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I have made the suggested revisions to enhance clarity and fluency.

Comment 2: Provide detailed figure legends and expand statistical descriptions (e.g., include sample size and error bars).

Response 2: Thank you for your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I have prepared a separate document titled "Legend of Figures," which includes detailed figure legends with information on sample sizes, and statistical significance for all figures.

Comment 3: Compare Q. brantii radioprotective effects with other natural compounds and synthetic agents.

Response 3: Thank you for your valuable feedback. I understand the significance of this comparison in providing context for the efficacy of Q. brantii. In response to your suggestion, I have added a paragraph to the discussion section that contextualizes our findings within the broader landscape of existing radioprotective agents.

Reviewer 3:

Comment 1: Given that the accuracy of the data is crucial for a manuscript, I must emphasize that Figures 1, 2, 4, and 5 were not analyzed using SPSS statistical software, and therefore, the results cannot be considered reliable or trustworthy. The text indicates that the results were analyzed with SPSS.

Response 1: Thank you very much for your valuable comment and for pointing out this important issue. We would like to clarify that all statistical analyses were indeed performed using SPSS statistical software, as stated in the manuscript. However, for the purpose of graphical presentation, Figures 1, 2, 4, and 5 were generated using GraphPad Prism, which provides clearer and more publication-ready visualizations. Therefore, while the statistical calculations and significance tests were conducted in SPSS, the figures themselves were reproduced in GraphPad Prism merely for visual representation. We have now clarified this point in the revised version of the manuscript to avoid any misunderstanding.

Reviewer 4:

Comment 1: The scientific name of the plant is, in many cases, grammatically incorrect. Please correct it.

Response 1: Thank you for your constructive feedback regarding the grammatical accuracy of the scientific name of the plant in our manuscript. We have thoroughly reviewed the manuscript and made the necessary corrections to the scientific name in all instances to ensure it meets the appropriate grammatical standards.

Comment 2: Please reference the following articles and use them in the conclusion section.

1. Quercus brantii gall alcoholic extract induces apoptosis by suppressing EGFR/HER2 signaling in human breast cancer cells
2. Anti-Inflammatory Effects of Quercus and Other Health Benefits
3. Oak (Quercus branti): an overview
4. A Comprehensive Review of Phytochemistry and Biological Activities of Quercus Species

Response 2: Thank you for your valuable feedback and recommendations regarding our manuscript. We appreciate your suggestions to reference additional articles, and I would like to inform you that we incorporated the relevant studies into our paper. We believe these additions enhance the depth of our discussion and provide a more comprehensive understanding of *Q. brantii*'s properties.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFeree : Reviewer

10 Oct 2025

Dear Editor,

The study presents valuable insights into the radioprotective effects of *Quercus brantii* extract, with significant implications for improving radiotherapy outcomes. Addressing the suggested areas for improvement would further strengthen the paper and its contributions to the field. Overall, this research lays a solid foundation for future investigations into natural radioprotectors and their potential applications in clinical settings. The responses provided by the authors are acceptable, but there are a few things that need to be corrected:

Quercus brantii should be italicized throughout the text. If an abbreviation is to be used, it should be introduced first in the text, followed by its abbreviation cited throughout.

In the text, lines 275 and 276 contain distinct dashes. This section appears to have been written with artificial intelligence. Please specify in the author contribution section the purpose for which artificial intelligence was used.

The order of the figures should be corrected.

In Figure 1, the font of the text differs from the others.

The texts in the figures are not clear, especially in Figure 5.

For Section 2.3, MTT assay, please cite the appropriate reference in the text.

REFeree : Reviewer

13 Oct 2025

The authors have addressed several of the reviewers' points satisfactorily

REFeree : Associate Editor

15 Oct 2025

The Ms needs some minor revision before suitable for publication in JJNPP.

REFeree : EIC

15 Oct 2025

Our impression is that the above-mentioned manuscript could become suitable for publication in JJNPP. However, the criticism from the referees requires that we defer a final decision until you have considered their remarks and revised your manuscript accordingly.

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.

Date: 19.10.2025

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your valuable feedback on our manuscript, "Investigating the Protective Role of *Quercus brantii* Extract on HT29 Cell Viability Following Ionizing Radiation Exposure" (Manuscript ID: 166550). We appreciate the time and effort you and the reviewers have dedicated to evaluating our work. We have carefully considered the comments and suggestions and made the following revisions:

Reviewer 0:

Comment 1: *Quercus brantii* should be italicized throughout the text. If an abbreviation is to be used, it should be introduced first in the text, followed by its abbreviation cited throughout.

Response 1: Thank you for your valuable feedback regarding my manuscript. I addressed the issues you raised. Specifically, I italicized "*Quercus brantii*" throughout the text and introduced the abbreviation as requested.

Comment 2: In the text, lines 275 and 276 contain distinct dashes. This section appears to have been written with artificial intelligence. Please specify in the author contribution section the purpose for which artificial intelligence was used.

Response 2: Thank you for your insightful feedback on my manuscript. I would like to clarify that I utilized artificial intelligence only for paraphrasing a few sentences in the article. I will update the author contribution section to clearly indicate this usage.

Comment 3: In Figure 1, the font of the text differs from the others.

Response 3: Thank you for your constructive feedback regarding Figure 1. I have corrected the font discrepancies to ensure consistency throughout the manuscript.

Comment 4: The texts in the figures are not clear, especially in Figure 5.

Response 4: Thank you for your valuable feedback regarding the clarity of the texts in the figures, particularly in Figure 5. In response to your comment, we have revised the text in the figures for improved clarity.

Comment 5: For Section 2.3, MTT assay, please cite the appropriate reference in the text.

Response 5: Thank you for your insightful feedback regarding Section 2.3 on the MTT assay. In response, we added the appropriate reference to the text to support our methodology.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : EIC

22 Oct 2025

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in JJNPP.

Your work underwent a rigorous peer-review process, and the reviewers and editorial board were impressed by the originality, scientific rigor, and relevance of your findings. We believe your contribution will be of significant interest to our readership and will advance the field of natural pharmaceutical products.

Before publication, our production team will contact you regarding final formatting, proofs, and any necessary administrative steps. Please ensure that all authors have approved the final version of the manuscript and that any required ethical or copyright documentation is in order.

On behalf of the editorial board, I congratulate you and your co-authors on this excellent work and thank you for choosing to publish in JJNPP.