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.89833
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 10(1); e89833

Peer Review Report for "Clinical Characteristics and Surgical Outcomes of Coronary Artery Aneurysm: A Case Series"

Author(s): Zahra Azizi, Bahador Baharestani, Maziar Gholampour Dehaki, Alireza Yaghoubi, Mohammad Hassan Ghafarinejad, Ali Sadeghpour Tabaei, Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Jan 2019
Revised Date:	10 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	13 Feb 2019

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) — 1 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Please see attached file, Major revisions needed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 2 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for the article. Everything is Ok. I hope they continue this study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 3 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,
Thank you for sharing us your valuable experience. Please consider the reviewer comments point to point in the new version of the manuscript.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 3 Feb 2019

Dear Authors

Your interesting manuscript needs minor revision before publication.

Many 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:

Dear Editors and reviewers

Thank you very much for your encouraging comments. We are very grateful for the reviews that appear to share our judgement that this study and its results are clinically important. Please see below, in green, our detailed response to comments.

1. Please add the title:

Authors Response: The tile was in the separate page as title page, but I added here as well.

2. Needs English language editing
3. Please check punctuations

Authors Response: Thank you very much for your comment, we edited the English language as well.

4. Six out of eight……

Authors Response: Done

5. Here better to rewrite by alphabet four, three vessels disease and more

Authors Response: Done

6. Practical conclusion needed

Authors Response: Thank you very much for your comment, we edited the conclusion.

7. Please obey journal writing format completely

Authors Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We changed the format.

8. Ethical consideration?

Authors Response: After obtaining informed consent, patients' clinical characteristics, past medical histories and surgical data were recorded retrospectively. This study was approved by ethics committee of Iran University of medical sciences.

9. No need for separate title the methods should be integrated

Authors Response: Done

10. Needs to compare the results with similar related papers

Authors Response: Thank you very much for your comment. We added the most recent paper about the results to discussion.

11. Please add the study limitation Why you assess until 2014, Now are 2019

Authors Response: We followed up the patients and assessed the data in 2017. We added follow up time to paper.

12. The table must rewrite left to right, The language of the paper is English ,

Authors Response: Done

13. Add the DOI of papers, Needs checking the year of refs. Some of them are very old, Must be newer

Authors Response: Done

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 13 Feb 2019

Dear Author
Thank you very much for taking into consideration the reviewers' comments and making the necessary changes.
Bests