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.86464
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(2); e86464

Peer Review Report for "Ameliorating Potential of Ginger (*Zingiber officinale* Roscoe) Extract on Liver Function and Oxidative Stress Induced by Ethanol in Male Rats"

Author(s): Abolfazl Akbari, Khadijeh Nasiri, Mojtaba Heydari, Majid Nimrouzi, Tayyaba Afsar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 1 Jan 2019
Accepted Date: 20 Feb 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) — 25 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The manuscript after minor revision can be considered for publication. See comments in the attached main manuscript document.
GOOD LUCK

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- In the material and methods explain each method briefly, it does not enough refer to reference
- Why liver index has not SD
- In dissection, a reference was used continuously. Ref 4-
- Which test was used in weight comparison in the repeated times.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Jan 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** (0) 1 Jan 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 (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.

Answer to Reviewers' Comments:

Dear Editor-in-Chief Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences

Dear Dr**.** Alireza Bakhshipour

Thank you so much for your attention in the process of reviewing and accepting our articles.

The valuable suggestions of reviewers were done and the correction was colored in manuscript.

Reviewer1:
The manuscript after minor revision can be considered for publication. See comments in the attached main manuscript document.

According to previous research the concentrations of ethanol that causes toxicity in body are various, the dose of 4 g/kg of Body Weight/day for ethanol was chosen in the study [1]. Also for selecting of ginger dose, we used from previous works[2].

Other comments were done.

Reviewer 2*:*
- In the material and methods explain each method briefly, it does not enough refer to reference.

Some methods for enzymes, MDA and total antioxidant capacity evaluation were added.

- Why liver index has not SD

SD was added in liver index.

- In dissection, a reference was used continuously. Ref 4-

The reference was replaced with others.

- Which test was used in weight comparison in the repeated times.

For evaluating body weight, we used repeated measures analysis.

1. Alirezaei, M., et al., *Betaine prevents ethanol-induced oxidative stress and reduces total homocysteine in the rat cerebellum.* J Physiol Biochem, 2011. **67**(4): p. 605-12.
2. Akbari, A., et al., *The Protective Effect of Hydroalcoholic Extract of Zingiber officinale Roscoe (Ginger) on Ethanol-Induced Reproductive Toxicity in Male Rats.* J Evid Based Complementary Altern Med, 2017. **22**(4): p. 609-617.

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) 25 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
Please the authors correct this comment:
- SE write as (±) in this sentence: " The mean values (+SE) of body weight"
- In the discussion, ref 11 repeated in one phrase.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 27 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
That is ok, now the manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Feb 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Feb 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.