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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jkums-126619
Published in: Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: 26(2) ; e126619

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Vegetable and Volatile Oils on the Piroxicam Skin Permeability: A Mechanistic Study"

Author(s): Anayatollah Salimi, Behzad Sharif Makhmal Zadeh, Ghazal Davood Baharvandi, Saeed Mohammad Soleymani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	16 Apr 2022
Revised Date:	22 Jun 2022
Accepted Date:	27 Jun 2022

Revision (0)

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

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 Prof.

Hereby, the answers to the arbitration are sent as follows:

1. Corrections were made and highlighted (by underline) in the text
2. References styles corrected by EndNote X8.

Sincerely Yours

Dr. Saeed Mohammad Soleymani

Pharm-D

Resident of Clinical Pharmacy

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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.

Dear Prof.

Hereby, the answers to the arbitration are sent as follows:

1- The total number of words in the text was reduced to less than 3500 words.
2- The number of abstract words became less than 250 words.
3- Highlighted sentences in the text were deleted.
4- The following sections were added to the article:
    a. Funding
    b. Data availability
    c. Consent for publication
    d. Authors' contributions
    e. Competing interests
    f. Ethical approval
    g. Acknowledgement

Sincerely Yours

Dr. Saeed Mohammad Soleymani

Pharm-D

Resident of Clinical Pharmacy

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 Prof.

Hereby, the answers to the arbitration are sent as follows:

1- The following sections were added to the article:
    a. Funding
    b. Consent for publication

Sincerely Yours

Dr. Saeed Mohammad Soleymani

Pharm-D

Resident of Clinical Pharmacy

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Milad Jalilian : Reviewer

27 Jun 2022

.