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.102937
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(3); e102937

Peer Review Report for "Oral Antibiotic Use Following Stented Hypospadias Repair: Does It Play a Role in the Prevention of Urinary Tract Infections?"

Author(s): Mohammed Suoub, Fadi Sawaqed

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 31 May 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Jul 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) 2 May 2020

Dear AE,
The study is interesting and the authors exhibited the using oral antibiotic will significantly reduce positive urine culture and risk of urine infection after surgery. However , it needs to minor comments:
- Kindly mention CONCLUSION
- Kindly apply a native experts, some lines have "Gramatical error or syntax" for example"Use of oral antibiotic post stented TIPU .." please change to"use of..."
kindly describe the main findings of the study in the first discussion.
- Please reformat the style journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 May 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled as above with great interest and enjoyed a lot but I think it needs some revisions as below:

1. Edition with an English spoken person.
2. Format should match as standards of journal.
3. Abstract and discussion parts need a better arrangement.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

11 May 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)

14 May 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.

Subject: Manuscript Resubmission

May 28, 2020

RE: Manuscript entitled as “Oral antibiotic use following stented hypospadias repair: Does it play a role in the prevention of urinary tract infections?”.

Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your thoughtful and valuable suggestions for the manuscript mentioned above.

Considering the reviewer comments, we would like to resubmit this manuscript. We assure you that the manuscript has been carefully rechecked, and all the appropriate changes have been made. Below is the response sheet, which may help referees’ in tracking the catered changes.

We would like to thank all the referees who invested their time and efforts in providing us the opportunity to improve our work. Therefore, we hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication in [Nephro-Urology Monthly].

Thank you for your time. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Authors

Mohammed Suoub and Fadi Sawaqed

Response to reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

1. Edition with an English spoken person

Response: The manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation and spelling

2. Format should match as standards of journal

Response: overall style and format was edited as standards of journal

3. Abstract and discussion parts need better arrangement

Response: Amended

Reviewer 2:

- Kindly mention CONCLUSION

Response: conclusion is mentioned

- Kindly apply a native experts,some lines have ''Gramatical error or syntax'' for example''Use of oral antibiotic post stented TIPU ..'' please change to''use of...''

Response: The manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation and spelling

- kindly describe main findings of study in the first discussion

Response: Main findings of the study were rearranged in the first part of discussion

please reformat the style journal

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

- Dear authors, please revise your manuscript as reviewers wish

Response: the manuscript was amended according to the reviewers' suggestions.

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) 23 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
With thanks to dear authors, the manuscript was edited properly and now is acceptable for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Jul 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.