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

International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijhrba.100781
Published in: International Journal of High Risk Behaviors and Addiction: 9(3); e100781

Peer Review Report for "Erectile Dysfunction in Methadone Maintenance Therapy"

Author(s): Somayeh Motazedian, Sepehr Entezam, SeyedShahab Banihashem, Ghazal Zahed, Ali Kheradmand

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 26 May 2020
Accepted Date: 18 Jul 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) — 27 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
This is an important article with a very specific theme. The article is well written, but I suggest that the data be better discussed because the discussion is still very superficial. The tables have little information, but I'm worried about the data from table 3. Did patients classified as Mild to Moderate receive 0 mg methadone? There must be some mistake that needs to be corrected.
Thanks

Zahra Ghiasi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 May 2020

Dear AE,
The comments have been attached.
regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 16 May 2020

Dear EIC,

the authors should:
answer the comments one by one
highlight the changes in the main file
recheck the ethical considerations, limitations, conclusion, and footnotes
regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 May 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.

Dear Prof. Nour-Mohammad Bakhshani

Thanks for review our manuscript. All the comments of the reviewers of the manuscript were corrected and highlighted in the text of the manuscript.

Sincerely

Ali Kheradmand

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) 13 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 18 Jul 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Jul 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.