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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.91276
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(2); e91276

Peer Review Report for "Antidepressant Effects of the Aqueous and Hydroalcoholic Extracts of *Salvia mirzayanii* and *Salvia macrosiphon* in Male Mice"

Author(s): Parisa Sarkoohi, Mohammad Fathalipour, Fatemeh Ghasemi, Katayoun Javidnia, Masoumeh Emamghoreishi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 19 Mar 2019
Accepted Date: 26 Mar 2019

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
What is not mentioned:
1- Abstract:
a: The name, number, age, and weight of animal.
2- Methods:
a: if all drugs are administrated by the same rote (IP)? Even Fluoxetine and imipramine?
b: Range doses of MNFD?
c: Reference for Measurement of locomotors activity?
3- Results:
a: IN PART 3-4-1 : use "showed " instead of "shows".
b: please compare positive control with test groups. P-value?
4-Discussion:
a: first-line: please write full name of the plant. S. .....
b: it needs more explanations about major components and effect mechanism.
5- Conclusion;
similar statements are in the last parts of discussion and conclusion about comparison between aqueous and hydroalcoholic extracts of plants.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

10 Mar 2019

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,

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments. The followings are responses to the reviewers' suggestions:

1- Abstract:

a: The name, number, age and weight of animal.

The name, number, age and weight of animal were added to abstract section, and were highlighted in yellow (in total, 148 eight-week-old male albino mice (25-35g) were used to carry out the forced swimming test).

2- Methods:

a: If all drugs are administrated by the same rote (IP)? Even Fluoxetine and imipramine?

All compounds including plant extracts and positive controls (fluoxetine and imipramine) were administrated by i.p. injection.

b: Range doses of MNFD?

Maximal non-fatal dose (MNFD) ranges for plant extracts was added to method section (75-900 mg/kg for hydroalcoholic extracts and 100-1800 mg/kg for aqueous extracts).

c: Reference for Measurement of locomotors activity?

Reference of locomotors activity test was added (reference number 24).

3- Results:

a: In part 3-4-1 : use "showed " instead of "shows".

The figure is presenting the effects of plants on studied variables, therefore, the verb "shows" is correct.

b: Please compare positive control with test groups. P value?

The positive controls were only used as reference drugs to make sure that the method was properly established in order to detect any possible antidepressant effects of plants. In addition positive controls served to determine the potential mechanism of antidepressant effects of plants in regards to norepinephrine or serotonin systems. Furthermore the aim of this study was to determine the possible antidepressant activity of two Iranian endemic plants, at this stage and it was not designed to compare the effect of plants to positive controls. Based on our positive findings, future studies can be designed to make such comparisons using different doses of positive controls and plants.

4-Discussion:

a: First line: please write full name of the plant. S. .....

Both plants were wrote by full scientific name at the first line of discussion, and were highlighted in yellow.

b: It needs more explanations about major components and effect mechanism.

The aqueous and hydroalcoholic (ethanol-water) extracts were used in this study. As different phytochemicals are present in different fractions of plants, therefore, we can only discuss about the

phytoconstituents presents in the studied fractions as potential candidates for the antidepressant activity of these plants. The authors searched for reports regarding the compounds present in these extracts of *S. Mirzayanii* and *S. Macrosiphon* and based on available data and our phytochemical screening we included all the potential compounds that might be responsible for antidepressant effects of these fractions in the discussion.

The mechanism of action of currently available antidepressants used in clinic is unknown. Therefore, at best, it is just stated on which neurotransmitter system an antidepressant acts. Given that, we can only propose that these plants may act at norepinephrine or serotonin systems based on our findings in forced swimming test as mentioned in the discussion. Nevertheless, the authors tried to make other suggestions in the discussion based on reports for some of phytochemical compounds exist in these fractions. Anyhow, as we do not know how antidepressants actually work, we have limitations for making suggestions regarding the antidepressant action of these plants. All potential possibilities have been stated in the discussion.

5- Conclusion:

a: Similar statements are in the last parts of discussion and conclusion about comparison between aqueous and hydroalcoholic extracts of plants.

The conclusion was revised entirely, and similar statement was deleted from the conclusion.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 26 Mar 2019

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