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

Iranian Journal of Radiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/iranjradiol.101804
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(3); e101804

Peer Review Report for "Placement of Totally Implantable Venous Access Ports Using the Single-Incision Technique: Outcomes and Complications"

Author(s): Seo Jin Jang, Jae Hyun Kwon, Yoon Ki Cha, Do Yeun Kim

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 11 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) — 26 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Although relatively large samples entered in this study; but this study's purpose was evaluation technical success, clinical outcomes, and complications of the single-incision technique for the placement of TIVAPs. In the current study, were used of retrospective data collected for medical care of patients can cause confounding. Since for evaluation of the effectiveness of treatment must be used of randomized clinical trial design.
Thanks.

Masoud Pezeshki Rad: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 28 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
- Title: Good, Proper article title that reflects the content appropriately.
- Abstract: Good, structured, and adequate. Kew words must be selected according to MESH.
- Introduction(background): acceptable. Good clarification of objectives.
- Materials and methods: Clearly describe the selection of patients and appropriate statistical analysis.
- Results and discussion: good
- References: appropriate and recent studies.

- Proper English writing
Final decision: approved.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Apr 2020

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

Madjid Shakiba: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 11 Jul 2020

Dear authors,
Your article is acceptable for the publication in IJR.
Regards