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.69246
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 15(3); e69246

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Herbal Formulation “Cystone®” on Urolithiasis"

Author(s): Anoush Azarfar, Zahra Rafiee, Yalda Ravanshad , Niloufar Saber Moghadam, Elham Bakhtiari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Apr 2018
Revised Date: 8 Jul 2018
Accepted Date: 29 Sep 2018

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) — 14 Jun 2018

Comments for the Author;

In the manuscript, authors evaluated the effect of Cystone® as an herbal treatment in urolithiasis as a systematic review. The authors concluded that Cystone® has more efficiency in the treatment of urinary tract stone in comparison with placebo. The paper is methodologically sound and all published papers up to December 30th, 2017 are involved. But there are some recommendations for the authors to fulfill the requirements for a possible future publication in Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products. The reasons are detailed in the comments below.

1. The Meta-analysis software characteristics should be fully included in the abstract and within the manuscript.
2. Since there are some grammatical errors and misspelling, it is necessary that authors check and revise paper carefully, preferably with the assistance of a native English speaker.
3. The legends of figures are incomplete.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Jun 2018

Dear author;

The manuscript is interesting but needs to be edited by an expert person.

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.

July 1th, 2018

Editorial office, Jundishpur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products

Re: response to the reviewer comments

Dear Editor in chief

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript. As detailed below we have added further explanations in order to address the reviewer concerns. We have addressed each concern by clarifying the data shown or its description. We thank the reviewers for comments which have strengthened the paper.

The manuscript was revised according the comments. Here are the details:

Responses to reviewer's specific comments:

Reviewer 1:

1- Reviewer requested the characteristics of meta-analysis software

We agree with reviewer. The characteristics of meta-analysis software was included in the abstract and manuscript

2- Reviewer asked editing the manuscript

Manuscript was edited and revised accordingly

3- Reviewer asked the completion of legends

Legends of figures were completed.

Reviewer 2:

1- Reviewer asked editing the manuscript

Manuscript was edited accordingly

Thank you so much for your attention and looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards,

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) 26 Sep 2018

Dear author;
your manuscript is accepted.