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.98039
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 11(1); e98039

# Peer Review Report for "Clinical and Laboratory Predictors of Mortality in Patients with Advanced Heart Failure (Stage D), Data Derived from Rajaie Acute Systolic Heart Failure (RASHF) Data Registry"

**Author(s):** Rabeah Zamani, Maryam Chenaghlou, Zeinab Norouzi, Mohammad Mostafa Ansari Ramandi, Sepideh Taghavi, Ahmad Amin, Nasim Naderi

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 28 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Dec 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**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 23 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks for sending the paper for our journal,
Would The authors please consider the following points:
- Your paper needs careful and strong English edition.
- Please mention the novelty of your study.
- Ethical code number is needed.
- Introduction must be extended and completed.
- You should report the results in past tense; this part needs precise editing.
- The discussion section needs more and deeper literature review .
- The conclusion part of abstract and main stem should be re-written based on your results.
Thanks.

**Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel**: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 24 Sep 2019

Dear Authors

Thank you for submitting your valuable article. I would like to inform you that your paper needs major revision according to our expert reviewers' comments.

Sincerely

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 Editor,

Thank you for your recommendations, our manuscript was corrected based on your recommendations.

1. There is not any study on stage D heart failure patients in Iran, due to significant differences between patients' characteristics all around the world; it seems these kinds of studies are useful for better management of these patients.
2. The ethical number is IR.IUMS.FMD.REC 1396.9411171014.
3. We changed the introduction part.
4. The results was reported in past tense.
5. The discussion section was reconsidered with additive literature review.
6. The conclusion part was written based on formal writing of journals.
7. English editing was done.
8. We correct the first author name as Rabeah Zamani

## 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 Nov 2019

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) — 12 Dec 2019

Dear EIC
According to the reviewers' opinion, the revised manuscript is ready for your final decision.
Regards

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 12 Dec 2019

Dear Authors,
Thank you for the revision of the manuscript considering the reviewer and AE comments.
Your paper is ready for the publication process.
Kind regards