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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research
Article DOI: 10.5812/amh.103603
Published in: Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research: 18(2); e103603

Peer Review Report for "Modified Double-Layer Microsurgical Technique: Effective and Desirable Method for Vasectomy Reversal"

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

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 24 May 2020
Accepted Date: 27 May 2020

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)

24 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for submitting your work
Please check below in your manuscripts
1- In the Title: The study is a comparison between two methods that are not mentioned in the title
2- In Background: explain differences between 2 surgical approaches.
3- Why do you select these 2 surgical methods (Modified Double-Layer microsurgical Technique (MDLT) compared with Three-Layer Technique (TLT) for evaluation?
4- Have all the surgeries been performed by one person? The surgeon's skill has no effect on the result of surgery?!
5- How many patients were examined in each group?
6- Explain more about how to divide the two groups and blinding
Thanks.

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: Associate Editor | Revision (0)

17 May 2020

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,

Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah: EIC | **Revision (0)** 18 May 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 Iraj Mirzaii-Dizgah, Editor-in-Chief, Annals of Military and Health Sciences Research

Thank you very much for sending me the comments on manuscript entitled: "**Modified Double-Layer Microsurgical Technique: Effective and Desirable Method for Vasectomy Reversal**". The valuable suggestions of the reviewer were taken into account and the paper was revised accordingly. The changes were highlighted. We submitted the last version of manuscript as track changes. We hope you find this version of the manuscript acceptable for publication and are grateful for the opportunity to improve this paper.

Sincerely,

Mohammad-Reza Mirzaii-Dizgah

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) 27 May 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.