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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.102127
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(4); e102127

Peer Review Report for "A Mini-review on Medicinal Plants Used for the Treatment of Jaundice in the Canon of Medicine"

Author(s): Jamileh Mahdavi Jafari, Shahdis Barimani, Fatemeh Aliasl, Ghazaleh Heydarirad, Mehdi Pasalar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 3 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Oct 2020

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 2020

Dear AE,
This is a fine manuscript, well written and well designed in the field of traditional medicine. Documents related to current studies are considerable. However I need to have additional keyword as below: Choleretic, Cholagogue and cholekinetic
Authors are to seek for related activities for extracted medicaments.
The second point is that there might be some mistakes regarding scientific names of the herbs.
Accordingly, authors are to check the names through “theplantlist.org” and correct the scientific names. With these modifications, the content can be accepted.
Thanks

Arman Zargaran: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 25 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
This is a fine manuscript, well written and well designed in the field of traditional medicine.

Documents related to current studies is considerable. However I need to have additional keyword as below: Choleretic, Cholagogue and cholekinetic
Authors are to seek related activities for extracted medicaments.
The second point is that there might be some mistakes regarding scientific names of the herbs.
Accordingly, authors are to check the names through “theplantlist.org” and correct the scientific names. With these modifications, the content can be accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 25 Aug 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-in-Chief,

Thank you very much for your helpful review of our submission. We addressed each of the reviewers' comments in the order they were received. We revised our manuscript with point to point clarification. The revised parts have been highlighted in yellow accordingly.

The comments were very useful to strengthen the scientific content of the manuscript. Therefore, we thank the reviewers and the journal for their time and consideration and we hope that these revisions meet your expectations.

Sincerely,

Corresponding author

No.	Original comments of the reviewers	Reply by the author(s)	Changes done on page/line numbers
Reviewer			
1	This is a fine manuscript, well written and well designed in the field of traditional medicine. Documents related to current studies is considerable. However I need to have additional keyword as below: Choleretic, Cholagogue and cholekinetic.	Thanks for your valuable comment. We inserted these items in the keywords.	Pages 1
2	The second point is that there might be some mistakes regarding scientific names of the herbs. Accordingly, authors are to check the names through "theplantlist.org" and correct the scientific names. With these modifications, the content can be accepted.	Thanks for your advisory comment. The manuscript rechecked again to meet your point.	Table

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.

Arman Zargaran: Associate Editor | **Revision** (**1**) 6 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
The current version is acceptable for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**1**) 9 Oct 2020

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