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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.83725
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(3); e83725

Peer Review Report for "Antibacterial and Antifungal Activity of the Aqueous and Methanolic Extracts and Essential Oils of Red Beets *Beta vulgaris* Leaves"

Author(s): Shokouh Ahmadi , Sabihe Soleimanian-Zad, Davood Zaeim

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	5 Sep 2018
Revised Date:	23 Jan 2019
Accepted Date:	1 Oct 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Abbreviation must write complete at the first, Example: BHI broth.
- The methodology hasn't reference.
- Which analysis methods were used?
- discussion is weak.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 10 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
- There is no explanation about negative control in the text except in table that was mentioned DMSO.
- The authors may explain; "In parallel with the antibacterial and antifungal investigation pure solvent was also tested, exhibiting no antibacterial …….activity"
we cant mention ampicillin and chloramphenicol as "chemical antibiotics".

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Jan 2019

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) 12 Jan 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 and Reviewers of Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences,

Thank you very much indeed for your invaluable feedback and suggestions for our manuscript entitled 'Antibacterial and antifungal activity of aqueous and methanolic extracts and essential oils of red beets *Beta vulgaris* leaves'.

We carefully considered your comments. Herein, we explain how we revised the paper based on those comments and recommendations. We have inserted our responses below to each comment. Changes made to the manuscript have also been highlighted by the color font (Red-lines) in the revised manuscript.

On behalf of all the contributors, I would like to humbly extend my sincere appreciation for taking the time and effort necessary to provide such insightful guidance.

Respectfully yours,

Sabihe Soleimanian-Zad

Comments of Reviewer 1:

Comment (1). There is no explanation about negative control in the text except in table that was mentioned DMSO. You may explain; "In parallel with the antibacterial and antifungal investigation pure solvent was also tested, exhibiting no antibacterial ……. activity"

Thank you very much for your suggestion. Positive and negative controls used in all experiments were added to "materials and methods" section.

Comment (2). We cannot mention ampicillin and chlormaphenicol as "chemical antibiotics".

Thank you very much indeed for your attention. This has now been modified in the manuscript.

Reviewer 2:

No Comment

Reviewer 3:

Comment (1). Abbreviation must be write complete at the first, Example: BHI broth.

Thank you very much for your attention. They have already been added in the revised manuscript.

Comment (2). The methodology hasn't reference.

Thank you very much indeed for your attention. The references have already been added to the revised manuscript.

Comment (3). Which analyses methods were used?

Thank you for your comment. A paragraph was added to the revised manuscript which explains analysis method used in the study.

Comment (4). Discussion is weak.

I really appreciate for your comment. Most of the discussion section was rewritten and extra references were added to extensively discuss the results.

Closing Comments to the Editor and Reviewers:

Again, we deeply appreciate the opportunity to revise our work for consideration for publication in Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. We hope our revision completely meet your approval.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 16 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Comments were done, only write $p<0.05$ in the statistical methods and correct the name of the comparison means between groups (I think ANOVA).
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 30 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Alireza Bakhshipour: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 1 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 1 Oct 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.