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.116404
Published in: International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism: 19(3); e116404

Peer Review Report for "References and Citations: Is It Time to Update Their Format?"

Author(s): Sai Krishna Gudi, Komal Krishna Tiwari, Rahamthulla Shaik

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 May 2021
Revised Date: 9 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 21 Jun 2021

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) 30 May 2021

Dear AE,
In the letter entitled: References and Citations: Is it time to update their format? The author(s) highlighted two important points regarding citation and references: (1) finding the original source to which reference has been cited and (2) variedness in citation credits. Overall as a letter, I think it is fine but I recommend the following revisions before publications.
1. I think it would be better to focus on these two points providing some practical solutions; although, some solutions have been mentioned they need elaboration.
2. Throughout the text, it is necessary to determine which sentences come from other sources putting their citation immediately after the concept and which are points of view of the author(s).
3. I suggest the first part of the letter be shorten since it reiterates previously published material and the second part of the letter (from the first issue .....) be extended.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Authors have addressed two issues about referencing and citations in the letter entitled

“References and Citations: Is it time to update their format?”. The first one is perplexity in identifying the exact content and the second one is unvariedness in citation credits for a multiple cited reference.

- The raised issues are important and the letter is a well written. However I would like to recommend the authors to fix the similar sentences for explicit writing. For example; line 51-59 contains many similar sentences and the first two paragraphs can be merged.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,

Reviewers' recommendations are to shorten the letter and present practical suggestions (if any) for fixing the raised issues.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,

The "letter" will be acceptable after minor revision.

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:

In the letter entitled: References and Citations: Is it time to update their format? The author(s) highlighted two important points regarding citation and references: (1) finding the original source to which reference has been cited and (2) variedness in citation credits. Overall as a letter, I think it is fine but I recommend the following revisions before publications.

1. I think it would be better to focus on these two points providing some practical solutions; although, some solutions have been mentioned they need elaboration.

Reply: As per the reviewer suggestion, changes have been revised accordingly. Authors have provided a practical illustration on the two points raised in this letter by giving appropriate examples.

2. Throughout the text, it is necessary to determine which sentences come from other sources putting their citation immediately after the concept and which are points of view of the author(s).

Reply: Authors have provided an immediate citation right after the concepts acquired from other sources differentiating from those of authors' own statements.

3. I suggest the first part of the letter be shorten since it reiterates previously published material and the second part of the letter (from the first issue …..) be extended.

Reply: Agreed, as per the reviewer suggestion, changes have been revised accordingly. The first part of the letter i.e., first 3 paragraphs have been cut-short into 2 small ones by focussing on the issues raised in the letter.

Reviewer 2:

Authors have addressed two issues about referencing and citations in the letter entitled

“References and Citations: Is it time to update their format?”. The first one is perplexity in identifying the exact content and the second one is unvariedness in citation credits for a multiple cited reference.
The raised issues are important and the letter is a well written.

However I would like to recommend the authors to fix the similar sentences for explicit writing. For example; line 51-59 contains many similar sentences and the first two paragraphs can be merged.

Reply: As per the reviewer suggestion, changes have been revised accordingly. Authors have merged the first three paragraphs into two short paragraphs. Also, authors have revised few redundant sentences for comprehension and explicit writing as suggested by the reviewer.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Reviewers recommendations are to shorten the letter and present practical suggestions (if any) for fixing the raised issues.

Reply: Keeping reviewers comments in mind, the letter has been revised accordingly. The revised letter has been cut short significantly for precision and focused more on the idea and issues raised in the letter.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The manuscript can be accepted. I however suggest that during copyediting practical solutions are embedded in the text.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 21 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript has been revised according to the suggestions and comments of the reviewers. It is acceptable for publication in the IJEM.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Jun 2021

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