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.65005
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(1); e65005

Peer Review Report for "Anti-adherence and Anti-fungal Abilities of Thymol and Carvacrol Against *Candida* Species Isolated From Patients with Oral Candidiasis in Comparison with Fluconazole and Voriconazole"

Author(s): Aghil Sharifzadeh, Hojjatollah Shokri, Farzad Katiraee

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Jan 2018
Revised Date: 6 Mar 2019
Accepted Date: 16 Mar 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)

6 Aug 2018

Dear author;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. The below comments should be considered for modification;

1- English writing should be revised by a native English speaker.
2- It is recommended to add the adhesion figures for each species to the manuscript as well.
3- Tables numbered 1-4 could be merged together as one table.
4- Significant differences must be described in tables too.
5- Discussion part and conclusion are a bit weak; Please fortify them with more comparing data and more relevant sentences. What is the perspective of the authors regarding this research?
6- Other comments and revisions could be found in the attached file.

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 22 Sep 2018

Dear author;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. I read manuscript entitled "Anti-Adherence and Anti-Fungal Abilities of Thymol, Carvacrol, Fluconazole and Voriconazole against Candida Species Isolated from Patients with Oral ". In my opinion this manuscript needs these revisions:

- This manuscript needs an English editing in whole the text.
- In abstract section, abstract is incomplete. Please write background.
- In background section, please write Objectives in Separate sections according to the journal format.
- In Conclusion section, please don’t used "we" in this sentence.

Good Luck!

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-in-Chief

Thank you very much for your kind e-mail. I would like to inform you that I corrected the paper point-by-point according to referees' comments in red color in the text.

;Responses to reviewer 1

1- English writing was revised by a native English speaker.

2- Unfortunately, we have not relevant figures now.

3- Tables 1-3 was merged, but authors decided to keep table 4 (now table 2) with current format.

4- Only significant difference was added to table 3.

5- Discussion and its conclusion were revised.

6- All comments mentioned in attached file were included in revised manuscript and authors thank for editing the paper by respect referee.

;Responses to reviewer 2

- English writing was revised by a native English speaker.

- Background was added to abstract section.

- Objective was added separately according to journal format.

- A new reference (2018) was included in the paper.

- I t is corrected.

.The consent letter was included in manuscript ***

Corresponding author

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 11 Mar 2019

Dear author;
The modifications are done completely. Thank you for your attention. Your manuscript is now accepted.

Good Luck!