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.99060
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Natural Pharmaceutical Products: 16(3); e99060

Peer Review Report for "Apoptosis-Like Cell Death in *Leishmania major* Treated with HESA-A: An Herbal Marine Compound"

Author(s): Jasem Saki, Khalil Saki, Reza Arjmand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 26 Dec 2020
Accepted Date: 4 Jan 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Bahman Rahimi Esboei: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Jan 2020

Dear authors;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. This manuscript must be edited and rewritten.

some comments are added to the main text, please edit them all.

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 Jan 2020

Dear authors;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. There are some points which need your attention.

Discussion should be revised, especially the first section.
there are some grammatical notes which have been highlighted within the PDF file by yellow

color. Please correct them.

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision (0)** 27 Apr 2020

Dear authors;

Thank you for choosing JJNPP for publishing your manuscript. There are some points which need your attention;

1. The English language of the manuscript is poor. It must be revised grammatically.
2. The format of citations in the text is not correct. It must be corrected entirely.
3. Please define all the abbreviated names just at the first use in the abstract and text.
4. What do you mean by “Reference drug”? (In the material section, please refer to the exact name of it). And please give the name of its supplier company.
5. What is the role of amphotericin B in the treatment of Leishmaniasis and also in your study?
6. Did you use amphotericin B for the positive control treatment? Why did not you use a pentavalent antimony compound as the positive control?
7. Why did you treat the promastigotes at stationary phase, not log phase?
8. The final concentration of MTT in the assay seems to be high. Please check the concentration (20 ul MTT in 100 ul final volume?!)
9. Some units should be corrected. For example; speed unit for centrifugation should be corrected as “G” .. Also”hours” should be corrected as “h”.

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 5 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 6 May 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
Thanks.

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

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We also greatly appreciate the reviewers for their complimentary comments and suggestions. We revised the manuscript accordingly. Please find attached a point-by-point response to the reviewer's comments. We hope that you find our responses satisfactory and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Sincerely

Reviewer 1:

Thank you and it's all done.

Reviewer 2:

1- Thanks and it was completely revised grammatically.

2- Thanks and it was done.

3- Thank you and it was corrected

4- It was done and name Supplier Company was added

5- Amphotericin B is the second-line treatment for leishmaniasis and due to the high anti-parasitic effect of this drug on *Leishmania* parasites, therefore, it has been used as a positive control in this study.

6- As mentioned in the previous answer, Due to the approximately 100% anti-parasitic effect of amphotericin B in vitro Compared to the lower efficiency of pentavalent antimony compounds, this drug use as positive control.

7- Because the stationary phase of the parasite is a stage in the life cycle that is transmitted to the vertebrate host (human), and it is also a stage that is phagocytosed by skin macrophages, this stage of the parasite's life cycle was used for study.

8- According to previous studies on *leishmania* parasites, this amount was used.

9- Thanks, All cases have been corrected.

Reviewer 3

Thanks, this section was 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.

Bahman Rahimi Esboei: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 18 Aug 2020

Dear author;

Still some corrections are needed for your manuscript as coming below;

This manuscript must be structurally and grammatically edited. Introduction, materials and methods are acceptable, but results must be explained more. Discussion should be rewritten.

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 5 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 9 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

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.

Thanks, dear referee

The manuscript was edited structurally and grammatically.

The discussion section was rewritten as much as possible, and if further correction is needed, the changes should be clearly stated

The items regarding the results will also be corrected if mentioned

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Mojgan Naghitorabi: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 25 Nov 2020

Dear author;

1- Please clearly identify at which time points MTT assay and flowcytometry have been performed in the methods and the results sections.
2- Please refer to the amounts and numbers in digits, not in letters except that they have come at the beginning of the sentences .
3-The conclusion section must be rewritten. Do not use the amounts or numbers in the conclusion (they have to be referred in the results and discussion). Try just to conclude your present results, not to discuss or compare them with others.

Thank you!

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 30 Nov 2020

Dear Editorial and authors;

I think all recommended editions are edited in main text and now there is not any problem to publish.

Best regards!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 1 Dec 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 13 Dec 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this

document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

Thanks for valuable reviewer comments,

Reviewer 1:

1- *Please clearly identify in the methods and the results sections at which time points MTT assay and flowcytometry have been performed.*

It was done

2- Please refer to the amounts and numbers in digits, not in letters except that they have come at the beginning of the sentences .

It was done

3-The conclusion section must be rewritten. Do not use the amounts or numbers in the conclusion (they have to be referred in the results and discussion). Try just to conclude your present results, not to discuss or compare them with others.

It was done and revised the conclusion

Reviewer 2:

I think all recommended editions were edited in main text and now there is not any problem to publish.

Thanks a lot

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 3 Jan 2021

Dear author;

Just a congratulation for being accepted!

Good Luck!

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 4 Jan 2021

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 4 Jan 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.