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

Iranian Journal of Pediatrics
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijp.111184
Published in: Iranian Journal of Pediatrics: 31(3); e111184

Peer Review Report for "Comparing Mathieu and Tubularized Incised-Plate Urethroplasties for Repairing Distal Penile Hypospadias: A Single-Center Experience with Long-term Outcome"

Author(s): Leily Mohajerzadeh, Arash Dooghaie Moghadam, Ahmad Khaleghnejad Tabari, Mohsen Rouzrokh, Nadiya Moghimi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 Nov 2020
Revised Date:	7 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	10 Apr 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) — 24 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
This is an interesting and valuable study.
Before publication I recommend
1. The abbreviation should be deleted from the title
2. The single center experience can be added to their title
3. Native English edition is needed before publication.
4. Is there any criteria for selecting the type of surgery or does it depend on surgeon experience and randomization?
Thanks

Mahmoud M.A. Elfiky: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 27 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Excellent paper. I would add more pictures of the long-term outcome.

Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Jan 2021

Dear AE,

1. Typing mistakes to be corrected

2. Reference should be written properly. DOI not needed. Please removed.

Should be revised and resubmitted.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Iran J Pediatr. Your manuscript has now been reviewed by three reviewers and an Associate Editor. I now have the reports of the Referees, which suggest that your manuscript might be suitable for publication following a number of revisions. I attach some reviewer comments and invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript addressing the points made.

Regards

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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear editor in chief
This is an interesting and valuable study.
Before publication I recommend

Thanks for your useful comments. All points revised by one by.
1. The abbreviation should be deleted from the title

Comparing The Results of Mathieu Versus Tubularized incised plate urethroplasty(TIP) (TIP) Surgical Techniques for Repairing Distal Penile Hypospadias: Long Term Outcome , *single center experience*

2. The single center experience can be added to their title

Comparing The Results of Mathieu Versus Tubularized incised plate urethroplasty(TIP) (TIP) Surgical Techniques for Repairing Distal Penile Hypospadias: Long Term Outcome , *single center experience*

3. Native english edition is needed before publication.

Edition was done
4. Is there any criteria for selecting the type of surgery or it depends on surgeon experience and randomization?

59 patients entered in the study that had been underwent original TIP and Mathieu procedures (31 in TIP and 28 in Mathieu procedure) by single surgeon on a random basis
Reviewer 2:
Excellent paper. I would add more pictures of the long term outcome.

Thank for your comment. But unfortunately I don't have suitable pictures from our patients.I apologize from you.

Reviewer 3:

1. Typing mistakes to be corrected

Thanks for your comments. the manuscript revised and all mistakes corrected.

2. Reference should be written properly. DOI not needed. Please removed.

All references checked and DOI was removed.

(24)Naveen Diwanand Thakur, Abhirudra Ramkrishna Mulay, Vikram Pramod Satav, Deepak Anandrao Mane, Vilas Pandurang Sabale, and Sharad Kumar Kankalia.Uroflow nomogram for healthy, 15-40 year old Indian men. Indian Journal of Urology. 2016 Oct-Dec; 32(4): 293–295.

(8) Kajbafzadeh AM, Yazdi CA, Rouhi O, Tajik P, Mohseni P. Uroflowmetry nomogram in Iranian children aged 7 to 14 years. BioMedCentral Urology. 2005;5:3.

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) 30 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
In this revised version of the manuscript, all of my comments were corrected.
Thanks

Pradyumna Pan: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 2 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
1. Plagiarism detection in the manuscript: The article is unique with no plagiarism detected
2. Analysis method of the manuscript: Appropriate analysis method has been adopted
3. Results : Well written
4. Correct referencing and citations: Reference are correct
5. Correct and proper English writing: accepted
6. Your decision about this manuscript (accept/revision/reject). accept
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 Apr 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 Apr 2021

Dear Authors,
The second round of peer review of your manuscript has been completed, and I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has now been accepted for publication in our journal.
Thanks