Comprehensive Health and Biomedical Studies
Volume 2 · Issue 4 · e154746

OPEN PEER REVIEW

In Silico Study to Discover the Possible Mechanism of Herbal Components Against the SOS Induction and Mutagenesis

Armaghan Honarbakhsh, Razieh Pourahmad Jaktaji

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
15 Mar 2024	30 Mar 2024	17 Apr 2024	10.5812/chbs-154746

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7

1 Original submission

1 comment · 4 Oct 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 4 Oct 2024

In silico study to discover the possible mechanism of herbal components against the SOS induction and mutagenesis

1- All abbreviations should be written out in full the first time they appear in the abstract and main text.

2- The necessity of conducting this study should be stated in the last paragraph of the introduction section. It seems that integrating the background and objective sections in the main text will help make the text coherent and help the reader better understand the importance of conducting the study.

3- Designing a figure and using visual effects in the background, as well as designing a graphical abstract, can help the reader understand better.

4- The binding site of RecA and LexA on the DNA strand should be indicated either in the text or in a figure.

5- Some examples of SOS genes should be mentioned.

6- If any substance is used, its code number and country should be mentioned in the methods section.

7- In the results section, the significance of the results should be mentioned as (mean ± standard deviation).

8- Avoid first-person references (phrases like 'our studies', 'We', or 'I', etc.).

9- The discussion section should be rewritten. In this section, it is necessary to compare the results of the present study with the results of previous studies and to critique them constructively. At the same time, examining the strengths and weaknesses of the current study and previous studies and offering constructive suggestions for future studies can help make the discussion interesting.

10- New references should be used from 2020 onwards.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reviewer1

Number	Comment	Answer
1	The article requires revisions to improve the quality of the English text	It was done by the aid of Iranpaper facility
2	*The number of references cited in the article is insufficient and should be increased*	It is increased
3	*Ethical guidelines for the study have not been adequately observed*	This is not a practical work, so the Ethical guideline is not applicable
4	*The author should respond to the comments provided in the manuscript*	There is not any file
5	*In the keyword section, it is better to use "Herbal medicine" instead of "herbal bioactives*	We worked on components of herbal medicine not herbal medicine itself, but we changed

Reviewer 2

Number	comment	Answer
1	*All abbreviations should be written completely the first time in abstract and main text.*	There is not any
2	*The necessity of conducting this study should be stated in the last paragraph in the introduction section. It seems that the integration of the background and objective sections in the main text will help the text to be coherent and the reader to better understand the importance of doing the study*	It added
3	*Designing a figure and using visual effects in the background as well as abstract graphical design can help the reader understand better.*	It was designed and added
4	*The binding site of RecA and LexA on the DNA strand should be indicated either in the text or in a figure*	It was added to the text
5	*Some examples of SOS genes should be mentioned*	Examples of SOS genes had already mentioned in Introduction section
6	*If any substance is used, its code number and country should be mentioned in the method section*	Their code number had already shown in Table 1
7	*In the results section, the significance of the results should be mentioned as (mean +- standard deviation).*	This is not the quantitative study. The P values presented in this study were calculated by server or software.
8	*Avoid first person citation (phrases like 'our studies', 'We' or 'I' etc.)*	It changed
9	*The discussion section should be rewritten. In this section, it is necessary to compare the*	This is the first time that this sort of study was used to find herbal bioactive against SOS response. I compared the

	results of the present study with the results of previous studies and to be constructively criticized. At the same time, examining the strengths and weaknesses of the current study and previous studies and using constructive suggestions for future studies can help make the discussion interesting.	tradition approach and network prediction to find new drugs against diseases.
10	*New references should be used from 2020 onwards*	They added

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 28 Dec 2024

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 28 Dec 2024

Manuscript Full Title: In silico study to discover the possible mechanism of herbal components against the SOS induction and mutagenesis

1- All abbreviations, such as SOS, should be written out in full the first time they appear in the abstract and main text.

2- Some references are outdated (update the reference list).

3- It is necessary to mention the ethics code related to the study at the end of the article in the "Ethics approval and consent to participate:" section. Otherwise, the article will not be accepted.

4- The purpose of the study should be mentioned in the last paragraph of the introduction; there is no need to mention it in the separate objective section.

5- In the discussion section, it is necessary to state the strengths and weaknesses of the study by using previous studies related to the present study. Constructive criticism can help inform future studies. In this section, suggestions for further studies are recommended.