Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Volume 25 · Issue 4 · e131816

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Investigating the Efficacy of an Herbal Medicine Package (Anti-Flu Pulmo-Health) Along with Common Medications in Alleviating COVID-19 Symptoms in Outpatients: A Double-Blinded Randomized Controlled Trial

Reza Hasanzadeh, Ahmad Reza Sharifi Olounabadi, Mohsen Farrokhpour, Khodakaram Aghaei, Mohammad Gholami Fesharaki, Mahboobeh Zarrabi, Fariba Abolhasan Tash, Shahaboddin Dolatkhah

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
18 Sep 2022	6 Feb 2023	18 Apr 2023	10.5812/zjrms-131816

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 2
2 Revision 1 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 Revision 2 Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

In the Name of the Exalted

Respected Editor-in-Chief of the Zahedan Journal of Medical Sciences
Dr. Bakhshipour

Subject: Response to the review of the article

,Greetings

Respectfully, while expressing our thanks and appreciation to the journal for reviewing the article, we hereby send you, as an attachment, the responses to the .comments of the respected reviewers

,Wishing you health and well-being

,With thanks
Corresponding authors

:Responses to the respected reviewers

:Reviewer 2

,Hello

:The following items should be explained by a statistics specialist

Based on which reference were these numbers in the sample size formula -1 ?calculated

In accordance with comment one, the relevant reference was added to the text and has been highlighted. To estimate the number of cases for determining the sensitivity or specificity of a new diagnostic test, since sensitivity and specificity are proportions, the formula $n=2\left(Z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}+Z_{\beta}\right)^2/d^2$ was used in this study to estimate the sample size. This formula is applicable when the disease status is known. The criteria for choosing the sample size were $\alpha=0.05$ and $\beta=0.2$ in addition d=0.5, which makes the sample size n .equal to 60

Hajian -Tilaki K. Sample size estimation in diagnostic test studies of biomedical informatics. J Biomed Inform. 2014; 48: 193 -204 .

Randomization must be stated completely transparently: how many blocks, -2 ?of what size, and from which software

.The requested items were added to the text and have been highlighted

.Blinding must be explained completely clearly -3

.The blinding method was added to the text and highlighted

?What does a p value greater than one thousandth mean -4

Because the article had been sent for translation and editing, a typographical error had occurred, and .in accordance with the respected reviewer's opinion, the correction was made in the relevant table

No explanation has been given about the interaction of time and group in -5 the tests examining the effect of time. It would be better to show some of the .results over time on a graph

An explanation regarding time and group, corresponding to Table 5 containing new data, was added to the text and has been highlighted. As shown in Table 5, the comparison of the p values of symptoms at days zero and five, and zero and ten, in the two groups indicates a significant difference .in the improvement of respiratory symptoms between the patients of the two groups

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

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.

Dear Dr. Bakhshipour,

Thanks a lot for your e-mail containing the minor revision. The comments were answered according to reviewer's comments. Please consider it. Thanks in advance for your cooperation and consideration and we are looking forward for your positive response.

Best regards,

Corresponding Authors

Associate Editor 1:

1-Type of randomization; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size) this variable with which the sample size is determined is not known, the death blood pressure or how different the sample size is determined?

Sample size is determined based on effect size of 0.5 which works for all variables in the study such as oxygen saturation, respiratory rate, dry and productive cough.

2-How did this amount of error in determining the sample size come about?

Base on moderate effect size which depends on mean and sd of variables.

3-What is the block size in randomization?

If we specify two in one block (the so-called block size is two), we can make two possible sequences of AB and BA. When we randomize them, the same sample numbers can be assigned to each group.

4-Why are pi values still shown with a larger sign, for example greater than one thousandth.

All of p values were checked according to this comment but in conversion to pdf format all of lower sign convert to greater than. So in word we changed signs to correct in pdf for reviewer.

3 Revision 2

2 comments · 18 Apr 2023 – 18 Apr 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 18 Apr 2023

accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 18 Apr 2023

accept