**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

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.100272
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(1); e100272

# Peer Review Report for "Nutritional Habits in Patients with Urinary Tract Stones Referred to Imam Reza Hospital in 2019"

**Author(s):** Hassan Niroomand, Vahid Rezaei, Mohammad-Reza Mirzaii-Dizgah

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 24 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 25 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

**Bijan Rezakhaniha**: Reviewer | Revision (0) 27 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for their attention to this important general problem (urinary tract stones).
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- In abstract: line 1 introduction; urinary stone change to : urinary tract stones
2- In introduction: paragraph 2: sentences have no references.
3- In methods: We are not allowed to use any abbreviation word without definition for the first time: FFQ
Is the number of your participants enough? I think that's too small, what is it in similar studies?
4- In the result section, only a few the percentage of participants' responses were expressed ( i didn't see 121 items? three part of questionnaire?) .
5- IN DISCUSSION: line1 paragraph 2 should be moved to the result section.
in last paragraph line 3 ; reference30 must be deleted.
6- In the result section, only a few the percentage of participants' responses were expressed ( i didn't see 121 items? three parts of the questionnaire?)
7- In the discussion section, each question of questionnaire must be introduced and analyzed. For this reason, in the discussion section, questions should be repeated and if

there was an article in this regard, it must be compared (with the references at the end of those) and the strength and limitations of their own study should be hinted at in the 'discussion' section.
8- references: No 6 must be corrected.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 4 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the comments of reviewers, this manuscript needs major revision.
regards

**Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah**: EIC | **Revision (0)** 5 Feb 2020

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.

Dear Editor in Chief

The manuscript was revised according reviewers' comments as track changes

**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.

**Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.