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.102622
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 18(2); e102622

Peer Review Report for "The Principles of Biomedical Scientific Writing: Citation"

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

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 14 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Apr 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) — 29 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
Comment for the authors:
1. Please more clarify about Self citation in this manuscript?
Thanks.

Hengameh Abdi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript entitled "The Principles of Biomedical Scientific Writing: Citation" was reviewed. It needs minor amendments by the authors before consideration for publication:
1) Both the section of "Abstract" and main text should have 4 primary titles according to the journal instructions including Context, Evidence acquisition, Results, and Conclusions.
2) Change the title of Supplementary Box 1; it has been mentioned as Box 1.
3) I have a question which would wish to be answered in this review article with evidence: When an original article has been cited by a review article and we want to cite the findings of that original paper in our manuscript, is citing to the review article correct? or we should cite to the original article of that study? Please consider this comment in your manuscript.
Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,
Based on the reviewers comments, the manuscript needs a round of revision.
Thanks.

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

Dear Author,
In addition to the reviewers' comments, please revise the manuscript to decrease the similarity detected during the screening; the related file has been attached.
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' comments:

Reviewer 1:

1)

Comment: Both the section of "Abstract" and main text should have 4 primary titles according to the journal instructions including Context, Evidence acquisition, Results, and Conclusions.

Response: *This is a review manuscript and cannot be arranged under these sub-titles.*

2)

Comment: Change the title of Supplementary Box 1; it has been mentioned as Box 1.

Response: *Agreed. It has been corrected.*

3)

Comment: I have a question which would wish to be answered in this review article with evidence:

When an original article has been cited by a review article and we want to cite the findings of that original paper in our manuscript, is citing to the review article correct? or we should cite to the original article of that study? Please consider this comment in your manuscript.

Response: *The primary sources (research articles written by those who conducted the research) are preferred. Secondary sources (review papers) can be used when primary sources are unavailable, or a summary for elaborating research problem is more effective, however, they should not be taken as definitive word or fact on the topic (Page 9, lines 193-197).*

Reviewer 2:

1)

Comment: Please more clarify about Self citation in this manuscript?

Response: Agreed. A brief description about self-citation has been added (*P 11, lines 235-239).*

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) 14 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors have satisfactorily addressed all comments in the revised manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 Apr 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.