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.66864
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 15(4); e66864

Peer Review Report for "Preparation and Evaluation of Physicochemical Properties of the Doxepin Mucoadhesive Gel"

Author(s): Majid Rajaee, Amir Talachi, Abbas Pardakhty, Ehsan Mohajeri, Negar Dehghannoudeh, Mohammadzaman Basir, Gholamreza Dehghannoudeh, Moslem Lari Najafi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Jan 2018
Revised Date: 6 May 2019
Accepted Date: 12 May 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)

3 Jun 2018

Dear author;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. Please do consider the following comments for revision;

1- In the gel formulation section, what is the basis for choosing such percentages and concentrations?
2- Some references should be added for thumb test and the other utilized methods. Also, the thumb test is not defined properly. It is not clear that how the author measured stickiness of the gels. In general, all of the methods need proper references.
3- The viscosity test should be explained in details (e.g. the spindle number, rotor speed …). Also, adhesiveness test is not explained clearly.
4- In release study, it is not clear that the author(s) have calculated the mean percentage or cumulative drug release.
5- The order of the results should be rearranged according to the methods.
6- The figures are not clear and are better to be replaced by ones with higher resolution.
7- The figures' footnotes are not complete and comprehensive (e.g. photographic conditions

in fig. 5 are missed.)
8- The references should be revised critically it terms of the lack of some basic parameters such as page number.
9- Lack of a comparative and comprehensive discussion appears in the manuscript. I suggest that the current results be properly compared with the other studies and discussed logically.
10- It is suggested that the manuscript be revised regarding grammatical and structural aspects.

With best wishes!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Jun 2018

Dear author;
According to below comments, unfortunately your manuscript can not be published in JJNPP:

1- No reference has been mentioned throughout the manuscript.
2- Line 61: cross reference to table 1 is not in a right place.
3- Line 97-99: a modified method should be explained briefly.
4- Fig1: graphs should be started from zero point.
5- Line 141-142: what is the reason for selecting formulation 6.
6- Line 153: viscosity has been repeated.
7- Line 155: results of adhesiveness should be discussed.
8- Line 158-159: results of pH determination should be mentioned.
9- Line 160-162: the text is irrelevant to the header.
10- Line 173: Chitosan has not been used in this study.
11- Line 183-184: results of these interpretations have been missed in the manuscript.
12- Line 187-190: sentences are not clear. They should be revised.
13- There is no use of tensiometer in the results and methods; it is just mentioned in the materials section.
14- There is no results about stability tests in the manuscript.
15- Results and discussion of the manuscript are not well written. There is no rational connection among paragraphs.

With best 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:

1. In the gel formulation section, what is the basis for choosing such percentages and concentrations?

According to Table 1 and references 9 and 10.

2. Some references should be added for thumb test and the other utilized methods. Especially, the thumb test is not defined properly. It is not clear that how did the author measured stickness of the gels. In general all of the methods need proper references.

According to reference 13.

3. The viscosity test should be explained in details e.g. the spindle number, rotor speed and ….. Also adhesiveness test is not explained clearly.

In the text corrected.

4. In release study it is not clear that the author(s) have calculated the mean percentage or cumulative drug release.

In the text corrected.

5. The order of the results should be rearranged according to the methods.

In the text corrected.

6. The figures are not clear and are better to be replaced by higher resolution ones.

In the figures corrected.

7. Also the figures footnotes are not complete and comprehensive e.g. photographic conditions in fig. 5 are missed.

In the figures corrected.

8. The references should be revised critically due to the lack of some basic parameters such as page number.

In the references corrected.

9. Lack of a comparative and comprehensive discussion appears in the manuscript. It suggests that the current results be properly compared with the other studies and discussed logically.

In the text corrected.

10. It is suggested that the manuscript be revised regarding grammatical and structural aspects.

In the text corrected.

Reviewer 2:

1- No references has beem mentioned throughout the manuscript.

In the text corrected.

2- line61: cross rference to table 1 is not in a right place.

According to references 8 , 9 and 10.

3- line 97-99: modified method should be explained briefly.

In the text corrected.

4- fig1: graphs should be started from zero point.

In the figures corrected.

5- line 141-142: what is the reason for selecting formulation 6.

According to Table 2, Formula 6 is three positive.

6- line 153: viscosity has been repeated.

In the text corrected.

7- line 155: results of adhesiveness should be discussed.

Maximum mucoadhesive formulations 6 force at special times by the surface tension tools is reviewed tensiometer and reported in Figure 10.

8- line 158-159: results of pH determination should be mentioned.

pH changes of formulation 6are measured by the pH meter over a specific time period and given in Table 6.

9- line 160-162: the text is irrelavent to the header.

In the text corrected.

10- line 173: inb this study, chitosan has not been used.

Chitosan has not been used.

11- line 183-184: results of these interpretations has been missed in the manuscript.

In the text corrected.

12- line 187-190: sentences are not clear. they should be revised.

In the text corrected.

13- there is no use of tensiometer in the results and methods, it is just mentioned in the materials section.

In the text corrected.

14- there is no results about stability tests in the manuscript.

Stability testing: appearance and physical properties, viscosity, active ingredient, mucoadhesiveness, and pH of formulation 6 are presented in Table 4. Pictures of formulation 6 using light microscopy magnification 100 times after the preparation and after one month of incubation at room temperature are shown in Figure 9.

15- results and discussion of the manuscript is not well prepared. there is no rational connection among paragraphs.

In the text corrected.

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) 8 May 2019

Dear author;

According to the following defects, your manuscript can not be published in JJNPP;

1- Reference 13 is not mentioned completely in bibliography.
2- Adhesiveness is not still explained clearly (comment 3 of reviewer 1).
3- There is no clear answer for comment 4 of reviewer 1.
4- The order of results has not been rearranged (comment 5 of reviewer 1).
5- Figure legends still need revision.
6- References still need revision.
7- There is no cross reference for table 1 in the text.
8- There is no clear reply or revision for comment 3,7,9 and 12 of reviewer 2.
9- The answer to comment 14 of reviewer 2 is not clear. There is no table 4 or figure 9 in the manuscript.
10- Discussion part still lacks rational connections, as well as it should be revised in terms of writing.

With best regards!

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

Dear Editor in Chief;

It seems that the author(s) have corrected the manuscript according to the reviewers comments.

Best regards!