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.101792
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(2); e101792

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Chronic Use of Methylphenidate on Spermatogenesis and Sexual Hormones in Adult Male Rats"

Author(s): Alireza Akhavan Rezayat, Amir Abbas Asadpour, Samaneh Boroumand Noughabi, Hassan Ahmadnia, Hamid Mohseni, Iman Broomand, Maliheh Dadgar Moghadam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Feb 2020
Revised Date:	29 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	14 May 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) — 18 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The study presents some interesting findings, however the language needs thorough revision as some sentences are unintelligible and as well as for the spaces that are sometimes missing and sometimes there are too many.
- In abstract section, for example ,please change 'including total-body and testis weight, spermatogenesis" to "including total body, testis weight..." and or, Materials and Methods This study was performed on 54eight-week, kindly correct to Materials and Methods: This study ...., Results The results revealedsignificant:plz modify to "Results: The results revealed significant...,Accordingly, the presentstudy provided,plz change to "Accordingly, the present study provided...
- Please add a conclusion the end discussion and a reference for the procedures.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 19 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I read the above-mentioned manuscript and enjoyed it a lot but it needs some editions

before publishing:

1. English language edition is needed

2. why you did not follow human patients with a history of chronic use of these drugs?

3. How spermogram was done? Technic and measurement and scales and normal values?

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 19 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 19 Apr 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.

Dear Dr. Behzad Einollahi

Thanks for your review, the answers and corrections are explained below

The corrections of reviewer 1:
All the things that were mentioned, in the text of the article was corrected and highlighted.
The conclusion was added in the end discussion and a reference for the procedures was added in number 55.

The corrections of reviewer 2:
1. English language editing was done.
2.In this study the biopsy has taken from rat testis, and this procedure was dangerous to human health, and it has a problem with medical ethics.
3.After the testes and epididymis were excised completely. Subsequently, the two ends of the epididymis were closed, kept in 2 ml of normal saline solution at37°C, and then rapidly transferred to the laboratory for spermogram assessments, including sperm count and motility.
Sperm analysis was done by an expert technologist with more than 10 years experience in analysis of human semen samples. The protocol was used is the same protocol used in clinical laboratories for analysis of human semen specimens. In this study, data is based on a comparison between control and observation groups, and that's why we haven't talked about normal values and scales.

Kind Regards,

On Behalf of
Dr. Amir Abbas Asadpour.

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) 11 May 2020

Dear AE,
I read the revised version of the above-mentioned manuscript and saw the revised items, I think now it is proper for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 May 2020

Dear EIC,
I agree with the reviewers and decided to accept the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 14 May 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.