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

Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals
Article DOI: 10.5812/mca.112369
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 12(2); e112369

Peer Review Report for "Assessment of Anticoagulation Control Association with Warfarin Knowledge and Demographic Features of Iranian Population"

Author(s): Mohammad Esmaeel Zangenehfar, Iman Harirforoosh, Bahram Mohebbi, Zahra Khajali

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 23 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 16 Feb 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Faranak . Kargar: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The followings are comments bear in mind and need to be revised before publication:
1- The present study is a description of a cohort of patients who completed the 6-month laboratory evaluation. So, indicating cross-sectional prospective study in the title is not appropriate and should be omitted.
2- This study is descriptive cross-sectional so defining endpoints in the present design is not appropriate.
3- The reference of the study which validated the warfarin knowledge assessment tool in the Persian language should be cited appropriately.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
The followings are comments bear in mind and need to be revised before publication:

1- The present study is a description of a cohort of patients who completed the 6-month laboratory evaluation. So, indicating a cross-sectional prospective study in the title is not appropriate and should be omitted.
2- This study is descriptive cross-sectional, so defining endpoints in the present design is not appropriate.
3- The reference of the study which validated the warfarin knowledge assessment tool in the Persian language should be cited appropriately.
BEST REGARDS.

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Jan 2021

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript. The article needs some revision based on reviewers' comments before the final decision.
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.

Dear Associate Editor:

Thank you for valuable comments of the reviewer, the first comment was done and the title corrected, for the second comment the end points changed and for the third comment questionnaire uploaded.

Regards

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) 31 Jan 2021

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

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 Feb 2021

Dear Author
Thank you for revising the manuscript and sorry for the delay in the reviewing process.
I am happy to inform you that your article is ready for publication at this stage.
Regards