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.85655
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(4); e85655

Peer Review Report for "Oxidative Stress as the Underlying Biomechanism of Detrimental Outcomes of Ionizing and Non-Ionizing Radiation on Human Health: Antioxidant Protective Strategies"

Author(s): Abolfazl Akbari, Gholamali Jelodar, Saeed Nazifi, Tayyaba Afsar, Khadijeh Nasiri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 8 Apr 2019
Accepted Date: 18 May 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) 22 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
Needs more and more writings, explanations, Tables, Figures, References and of course English improvement if the paper wishes to be published as a "Review Article"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well written and the topic also well suited with the scope of the journal.
I enjoyed the topic and all research stages till end of conclusion.
It can be published in the journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
thanks to the authors for submitting the manuscript to this journal. unfortunately, it does not cover the minimum standards of a review article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 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) 20 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.

Latter response to Reviewers' Comments

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Needs more and more writings, explanations, Tables, Figures, References and of course English improvement if the paper wishes to be published as a "Review Article"

***Dear Reviewer 1*, the grammatical errors of the manuscript were corrected and distinguished in red color.**

Review's reforms ***and comments from dear Reviewer were made in the text of the article.***

Reviewer 2:
The manuscript is well written and the topic also well suited with the scope of the journal.
I enjoyed the topic and all research stages till end of conclusion. It can be published in the journal.

Review's reforms ***and comments from dear Reviewer were made in the text of the article.***

Reviewer 3:
Dear Authors,
thank you for submitting your manuscript in this journal. unfortunately, it does not cover the minimum standards of a review article.

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) 9 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have not noticed grammatical points in detail which puts it at the risk of rejection!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 6 Apr 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 6 Apr 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Latter response to Reviewers' Comments

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Authors have not noticed in grammatical points in details which puts it to the risk of rejection!

Dear Reviewer,

The grammatical errors of the manuscript were corrected and distinguished in red color. Review's reforms and comments from dear Reviewer were made in the text of the manuscript. This manuscript was re-evaluated and grammatical points were resolved.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 11 May 2019

Dear AE,
It appears to be fine.
The figure's caption needs to be extended.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 18 May 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 18 May 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.