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.88515
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(2); e88515

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of *Anacyclus pyrethrum* Alcoholic Root Extract on FSH, LH, Testosterone and Sperm Count in Diabetic Male Rats"

Author(s): Mohammad Reza Shahraki, Javad Dehvari, Mahnaz Shahrakipoor, Elham Shahraki, Ahmmad Reza Sharaki, Ali Reza Dashipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	31 Dec 2018
Revised Date:	22 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	2 Mar 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 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
I think that the manuscript can be published after doing these major comments. Authors must do these alterations. Also English of the manuscript is poor and must be checked.
Abstract:
1- In background write testosterone with lowercase.
2- About the Statistical differences that you said were significantly recognized by $p \leq 0.05$. It isn't true, $P<0.05$ is true.
1- In the result part, write in comparison with one of this group AC or P. this type of writing is not true. One of them is control and should be compared.
2- Write data as mean+SEM, Because your error bars is height. SEM = SD/(square root of sample size "number of animal in each group").
3- In keyword write Diabetes in singular form.
Background
4- In line 4 write "this" with lowercase. Also line 9 correct the word glycation "end". Also, it is better to write 31th instead of the 31st.

5- When you use et al. don't write and. Delete and in this sentence "Selles and et.al. in" also "Sharma and et al."

Methods

1- am and pm should be writing with lowercase. Also ad-libitum should be writing italic.

2- Change the words "was purchased from a store in Saravan (a city located in southwest of Iran)" and write purchased from herbal drugstore.

3- In one part you said that data were analyzed by SPSS11 software and in the abstract, you said version 22 which one?????

4- In Result you must to compare groups with DC group not with P group. Change all tables and figures.

5- Figures are not suitable. Stars are not on the error bars. Use SEM your error bars is too long.

6- You say that you use the Tukey test why you don't compare your etanolic extract doses with each other??? Which one of the doses has better effect???

7- Give your manuscript to someone for English editing it is full of mistakes.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Jan 2019

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

1. For one- way ANOVA test, data should be normal and variances should be homogeneous. Have you checked normality test and homogeneity of variance test?
2. SPSS11 software or SPSS V.22?!!
3. How did you calculate sample size?

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Jan 2019

Dear AE,

Thanks to the authors for doing this valuable research and submission the manuscript to the journal.

The overall content of this manuscript is good and the recommendation is accepted.

However, the manuscript needs to be rewritten. There are many grammatical errors.

- The introduction is good but not enough.
- Materials and methods are suitable.
- The results could be better expressed.
- The titles of tables and charts are not appropriate.
- The discussion is partly suitable.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 29 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) 29 Jan 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

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 **" The Effects of *Anacyclus Pyrethrum* Alcoholic Root Extract on FSH, LH, Testosterone and Sperm Count in Diabetic Male Rats"**
We carefully considered your comments. Here in, 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 based on reviewers have also been highlighted by the blue color font when changed grammatically and yellow- bold lines when corrected based on reviewers comments in the revised manuscript.

Respectfully yours,

Reviewer 1:

Dear author(s)

Thank you for doing your valuable research and submission the manuscript to the journal.

The overall content of this manuscript is good and the recommendation is accepted. However, the manuscript needs to be rewritten. There are many grammatical errors.

Thank you for valuable comments, Article *rechecked and rewritten.*

Grammatical chances were pointed by blue font.

Introduction is good but not enough.

Introduction revised and added some sentences that marked with gray color in the lines 43-47 and 55-60

**Materials and methods are suitable.*

Thank you for your kindness

The results could be better expressed.

Thank you for valuable comments, they were modified

The titles of tables and charts are not appropriate.

Thank you for valuable comments. They were changed and marked by yellow color in lines 353-354, 363-364, 381-382, 391-392, 411-412, 429.

**The discussion are partly suitable*

Thank you for your kindness

Reviewer 2:

Dear editor. I think that the manuscript can be published after doing these major comments. Authors must to do these alterations. Also English of the manuscript is poor and must be checked.

Thank you for valuable comments, Article *rechecked and rewritten.*

Grammatical chances were pointed by blue font.

Abstract:

1- In background write testosterone with lowercase.

Thank you for your attention. It was corrected and bold in line 6

2- About the Statistical differences that you said were significantly recognized by p ≤ 0.05. It isn't true, P<0.05 is true

Thank you for your attention. It was corrected and bold in lines 15 and 16

1- In result write in comparison with one of this group AC or P. this type of writing is not true. One of them is control and should be compared.

By best regards, we haven't AC group and comparison were done among DC or P groups and others. It mentioned in lines 134-137 and 141-145.

2- Write data as mean+SEM, Because your error bars is height. SEM = SD/(square root of sample size "number of animal in each grop").

Thank you for valuable comment. It was done in figures and tables.

3- In keyword write Diabetes in singular form.

I think Diabetes is singular form *and "s" make it noun*.

Background

4- In line 4 write "this" with lowercase. Also line 9 correct the word glycation "end". Also it is better to write 31th instead of 31st. **Thank you for your attention. They were corrected *in lines 35,40 and47.***

5- When you use et al. don't write and. Delete and in this sentence "Selles and et.al. in" also "Sharma and et al."

Thank you for your attention. All of them corrected and bold with yellow color

Methods

1- am and pm should be writing with lowercase. Also ad-libitum should be writing italic.

Thank you for your attention. All of them corrected in lines 78 -79 and bold with yellow color

2- Change this words "was purchased from a store in Saravan (a city located in southwest of Iran)" and write purchased form herbal drugstore.

Thank you for your attention. All of them corrected in line 96 and bold with yellow color

3- In one part you said that data were analyzed by SPSS11 software and in abstract you said version 22 which one????? .

Thank you for your attention. SPSS ver11 is correct. It corrected in lines 16-17

4- In Result you must to compare groups with DC group not with P group. Change all tables and figures.

. **Thank you for your attention. They corrected and wrote in lines 355,365,383**

5- Figures are not suitable. Stars are not on the error bars. Use SEM your error bars is too long.

Thank you for your attention. They corrected in figures and tables and wrote in lines 353,363,381,391,411and 429 *too*

6- You say that you use Tukey test why you don't compare your etanolic extract doses with each other??? Which one of doses has better effect???

Thank you for valuable comment .The comparison were showen in the tables by different value and in the lines 228-230

7- Give your manuscript to someone for English editing it is full of mistakes

Thank you for valuable comments, Article *rechecked and rewritten.*

Grammatical chances were pointed by blue font.

Reviewer 3:

1. For one- way ANOVA test, data should be normal and variances should be homogeneous. Have you checked normality test and homogeneity of variance test? ***Thank you for valuable comments*****. yes, normality was checked by kolmogrof smirnove and data had normol distribution**.

2. SPSS11 software or SPSS V.22?!! .

Thank you for your attention. SPSS ver.11 is correct. It corrected in lines 16-17

3.How did you calculate sample size?

Thank you for your attention. Usually, in the animal studies, sample size is about 5-10 animals. It can be see in previous studies ordinary.

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) 27 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript can be accepted.
Sincerely

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

Dear AE,
The authors did all comments exactly. I think that manuscript can be accepted now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
Please draw the graphs with the software of "graph pad"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 2 Mar 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 Mar 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.