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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.100159
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(1); e100159

Peer Review Report for "The Principles of Biomedical Scientific Writing: Abstract and Keywords"

Author(s): Zahra Bahadoran, Parvin Mirmiran, Khosrow Kashfi, Asghar Ghasemi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 11 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 13 Jan 2020

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Hosseinpanah: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Following publication of five previous papers regarding “The Principles of Biomedical Scientific Writing”, in this manuscript, the authors provided a practical guide into writing an abstract. The manuscript is well written and covers all important issues in terms of writing of an abstract; including content, function and organization. I have only few suggestions to be considered by the authors before publication.
1) The authors can provide common mistakes in writing of an abstract in a table
2) Based on last ICMJE recommendation funding sources should be listed separately after the abstract.it would be better to put this recommendation somewhere in the manuscript
3) The ICMJE also recommends that journals publish the clinical trial registration number at the end of the abstract. please consider this point as well.
4) I would like to draw author’s attention to this paper. “Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals Updated December 2018”.it can be accessed from www.icmje.org

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
In the sixth of the “The Principles of Biomedical Scientific Writing” series, Bahadoran et al. have introduced the key elements of abstract and steps for writing a good abstract and selecting keywords for a hypothesis testing biomedical paper.
This is an interesting and well written manuscript and I recommend it for publication in the IJEM. I also recommend the authors to consider the reviewer's suggestion to improve the quality of their manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Jan 2020

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.

Response to reviewers

Reviewer#1

1.
Comment: The authors can provide common mistakes in writing of an abstract in a table

Response: *Agreed. Section 7 (P.13) as "Most common flaws and mistakes in writing an abstract" and a table summarizing these points have been added to the manuscript.*

2.
Comment: Based on last ICMJE recommendation, funding sources should be listed separately after the abstract. It would be better to put this recommendation somewhere in the manuscript

Response: *Agreed. We have now added this on P8, section 3.6.*

3.
Comment: The ICMJE also recommends that journals publish the clinical trial registration number at the end of the abstract. Please consider this point as well.

Response: *Agreed and added to P8, section 3.6.*

4.
Comment: I would like to draw author's attention to this paper. "Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals Updated December 2018".it can be accessed from www.icmje.org

Response: *Agreed. The guide has been used in the manuscript.*

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 13 Jan 2020

Dear Authors,
You responded to reviewer comments satisfactory and relevant changes have been made in manuscript.
Thanks.