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.82793
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 15(3); e82793

Peer Review Report for "Enhanced Therapeutic Efficacy of Vincristine Sulfate for Lymphoma Using Niosome-Based Drug Delivery"

Author(s): Mohammad Reza Mehrabi, Mohammad Ali Shokrgozar, Tayebeh Toliyat, Masoomeh Shirzad, Azadeh Izadyari, Laya Zoghi Mofrad, Mohsen Chiani, Azim Akbarzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Aug 2018
Revised Date: 1 Sep 2018
Accepted Date: 16 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) 13 Aug 2018

Dear Editor-In-Chief
The manuscript describes the preparation of PEGylated niosomes containing vincristine sulfate and their in vitro and in vivo activities. The manuscript is interesting and has a good structure and well written. However, some minor revisions must be done before the publication in the journal.

Minor revisions include:
1. What is the reason for the addition of PEG 3000 in the formation of niosomes? Please add a detailed discussion in the text.
2. The Author should present a reference for released study.
3. How zeta potential affects on the stability of niosomes? A discussion part must be incorporated into the manuscript.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Aug 2018

Dear Editor;

The manuscript "Enhanced therapeutic efficacy of vincristine sulfate for lymphoma using niosome-based drug delivery" presents interesting and clinically important results about the application of vincristine sulfate. It is well written, has important clinical message, and should be of great interest to the readers. A few issues, however, need to be addressed:

1. Using the term “animals were killed ” appears odd. The term sacrificed is more academic. (materials and methods).

2. "Individual properties" such as compatibility, bioavailability, etc., are incomprehensible, therefore, individual properties need to be changed. (discussion).

3. The viability of lymphoma cells was "reversely" correlated to the drug concentration is not correct, it seems that the author meant to say "inversely correlated".

4. In addition, there are several grammatical errors that need correction.

Overall, it is an important study, and should be considered for publication in JJNPP, once the above issues have been resolved.

With best regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Aug 2018

Dear Author;
Please consider below hints:

English editing is recommended.

It is better to use passive sentences.

The authors must clarify the time interval for sample withdrawal during the in vitro release study.

What was the reason for studying the release of drug through/from the niosomes for 36 hrs?

The authors have not mentioned the role of excepients in the formulation.They must state their roles in the niosomal formulation.

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.

Response to Reviewers:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor

The manuscript "Enhanced therapeutic efficacy of vincristine sulfate for lymphoma using niosome-based drug delivery" presents interesting and clinically important results about the application of vincristine sulfate. It is well written, has important clinical message, and should be of great interest to the readers. A few issues, however, need to be addressed:
1. Use of term "animals were killed " appears odd. The term sacrificed is more academic. (materials and methods).

Author response: You are right, the suitable term was replaced.

2. "Individual properties" such as compatibility, bioavailability, etc., are incomprehensible, therefore, individual properties need be changed. (discussion).

Author response: This paragraph was completely changed and replaced by the new explanation.

3. The viability of lymphoma cells was "reversely" correlated to the drug concentration is not correct, it seems that the author meant to say "inversely correlated".

Author response: This sentence was corrected according to your comment.

4. in addition, there several grammatical errors that need correction.

Author response: We do our best to correct all grammatical errors as much as possible.

Overall, it is an important study, and should be considered for publication in JJNPP, once the above issues have been resolved.

With best regards

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editor-In-Chief
The manuscript describes the preparation of PEGylated niosomes containing vincristine sulfate and thier in vitro and in vivo activities. The manuscript is interesting and has a good structure and well written. However, some minor revisions must be addressed before the publication in the journal.

Minor revisions include:

1. What is the reason for the addition of PEG 3000 in the formation of niosomes? Please add a detailed discussion in the text.

Author response: The hydrophilicity of PEG increases the solubility of hydrophobic drugs. It provides drugs with a greater physical and thermal stability as well as preventing or reducing aggregation of the drugs in vivo, as well as during storage, as a result of the steric hindrance and/or masking of charges provided through formation of a “conformational cloud”.

Reference: Knop K, Hoogenboom R, Fischer D, Schubert US. Poly(ethylene glycol) in drug delivery: pros and cons as well as potential alternatives. Angew Chem Int Ed Engl. 2010 Aug 23;49(36):6288-308. doi: 10.1002/anie.200902672.

2. The Author should present a reference for release study.

Author response: The related reference was presented.

Sathali AH, Rajalakshmi AG (2010). Evaluation of transdermal targeted niosomal drug delivery of terbinafine hydrochloride. International Journal of PharmTech Research, 5:1367-1375

3. How zeta potential effects on the stability of niosomes? a discussion part must be incorporated into the manuscript.

Author response: Your suggestion was carried out.

Zeta potential is a measure of the magnitude of the electrostatic or charge repulsion/attraction between particles and is one of the fundamental parameters known to affect stability. The negative Zeta-potential of prepared niosomes provides high physical stability to the dispersion due to electrostatic repulsions between the particles in suspension.

Reviewer 3:
Improvement to the language is recommended. It is better to use passive sentences. However, ***The authors must clarify the time interval for sample withdrawal during the in vitro release study.***

Author response: As mentioned in figure 1: the time intervals were as follow: 0, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 28, 36.

What was the reason to study the release of drug through/from the niosomes for 36 hrs?

Author response: Usually, the release study continued as long as the releasing rate becomes constant. In this study the rate of release was constant during the time of 28 to 36 h.

The authors have not mentioned the role of excepient in the formulation. They must state their roles in the niosomal formulation.

Author response: Your suggestion was carried out.

Span 60 or sorbitan monostearate is the main excipient in formation of noisomes. It is used in the manufacture of food and healthcare products and is a non-ionic surfactant with emulsifying, dispersing, and wetting properties.

Cholesterol plays a strategic role in niosome composition. It is used as a stabilizer that reduces bilayer permeability, improve vesicle resistance to aggregation, increase the fluidity of vesicles' membrane to make them more rigid and sustain in severe shear stress of the lipid bilayer.

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 Sep 2018

Dear Editor;

The manuscript " Enhanced therapeutic efficacy of vincristine sulfate for lymphoma" has been revised by the authors and all reviewers' comments have been fulfilled except item 3 of reviewer 1. Kindly change reversibly correlated to inversely correlated.

Decision: Accepted

with best regards