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

Nephro-Urology Monthly
Article DOI: 10.5812/numonthly.100366
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(2); e100366

Peer Review Report for "Liver Transplantation Outcome in Iranian Patients with Primary Hyperoxaluria; Risks and Perspectives"

Author(s): Seyed Mohsen Dehghani, Kamran Bagheri Lankarani , Iraj Shahramian, Ali Bazi, Hakimeh Shahabi, Kurosh Kazemi, Siavash Gholami, Seyed Ali Malek-Hosseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 Dec 2019
Revised Date: 12 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 6 Mar 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript reviewed, it is valuable research, but the result section is missed. After correction, it could be acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 25 Jan 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Reviewers' Comments:

The list of authors in the current revision is different from Revision 0.

Reply: The list was adjusted to the revision 0. Actually, we did not detect any change in order or authors' names.

Ethical Approval: Not OK

Reply: The ethical code was provided.

Informed Consent: Not OK

Reply: As this was a retrospective study, obtaining informed consent was inapplicable.

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) 6 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The revised manuscript is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 6 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.