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

International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijem.102269
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(Suppl); e102269

Peer Review Report for "The Concept of Cure in Thyroid Diseases"

Author(s): Fereidoun Azizi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 2 May 2020
Accepted Date: 6 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) — 9 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The author(s) tried to highlight the concept of cure in this manuscript. It is a well written manuscript but some points should be noticed:
1- The manuscript just have introduction; labeling other parts including conclusion are missing.
2- The aim of this review should be clarified.
3- page 4 , line 12 permanent is misspelled.
4- page 4,line 16, sub-ablative is misspelled.
5- page 4, line 18, respectively is needed after “hyper-and euthyroid”.
6- page 4, line 20, respectively is needed after 3.3%.
7- page 4, line 20, permanent is misspelled.
8- there are some punctuation errors throughout the text that should be corrected.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript was reviewed. I have included my comments using track changes. Please find the attached file.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
In addition to reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs a critical English editing.
Thanks.

Fereidoun Azizi & Dr. Azita Zadeh-Vakili: EIC | **Revision** (0) 30 Mar 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.

Response to Reviewers

Reviewer 1:

1. Agreed, other parts were included.
2. Agreed and the aim of this review was added.
3. Corrected.
4. Corrected.
5. Added.
6. Added.
7. Corrected.
8. Corrected.

Reviewer 2:

1. All misspellings were corrected.
2. Other parts of article were titled and Method section was added.
3. Page 4, first line: Agreed and Corrected.
4. Page 4, end of para 1: Agreed and shortcomings of LT4 therapy was added.
5. Page 5: Agreed and “Conclusions” was added.
6. Table 1:
    a) With ablative doses of RAI nearly 100% of patients become hypothyroid

b) Those taking long-term MMI (while of medication) fulfill criteria for “controlled”.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 6 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 6 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.