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.99875
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(1); e99875

Peer Review Report for "Hepatoprotective Effect of *Allium hooshidaryae* Hydroalcoholic Extract on Acetaminophen-Induced Hepatotoxicity in Male Rats"

Author(s): Saeed Ovji , Dara Dastan, Sara Soleimani Asl , Amir Nili-Ahmadabadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 15 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Jun 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 18 Jan 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) — 20 Jan 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

We appreciate the time and efforts by you and reviewers in reviewing the manuscript entitled: ***Hepatoprotective effect of Allium hooshidaryae hydroalcoholic extract on acetaminophen induced hepatotoxicity in male rat.*** Authors are very much thankful to the reviewers for their deep and thorough review. We have revised our present manuscript in the light of their useful suggestions and comments. We hope our revision has improved the manuscript to a satisfaction level. Number wise answers to their specific comments/suggestions/queries are as follows.

Best regards

Associate Editor 1:

1- at first all,the text has to editing.

The manuscript was revised according to your comment.

2- title change to "hepatoprotective effect of Allium Hooshidaryae hydroalcoholic extract on acetaminophen induced hepatotoxicity in male rat"

The title was revised according to your comments.

3- rewrite grouping in abstract ant the text because are not clear.

Positive, negative and therapeutic control groups were identified in the text.

4- re write the results and discussion and statistic part (p value??, SPSS version???,...).

Data were analyzed again with SPSS software version 20 (IBM, Armonk, NY, USA). In addition, differences were determined, at 95% confidence (*P*-value < 0.05), using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey’s test to account for multiple comparisons.

5- bach number of chemicals has to insert it.

CAS number was inserted for each chemical material.

6- re correct AUTOMATIC TISSUE PROCESSOR

The main text was revised.

7-just write figure 2 in level NO,LPO,....

The main text was revised.

8- some ref.have not pages such as 7,29

The references were revised

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The respected author corrected all of comments .I agree to publish the article, just the abstract line of three rewrite the hepatoprotective instead of protective.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Jun 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.