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.103276
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(4); e103276

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Vesicoureteral Reflux and Urinary Tract Infection in Children with and without Urolithiasis"

Author(s): Parsa Yousefichaijan, Fatemeh Safi, Masoud Rezagholizamenjany, Mino Safari, Fakhreddin Shariatmadari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 10 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Oct 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) — 10 May 2020

Dear AE,
The organization of the data is presented well and information is conveyed to the reader. I had no major scientific issues, so I recommend the manuscript for acceptance.
Thanks.

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

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled as "Prevalence of Vesicoureteral Reflux in Children with and without Urolithiasis " with great interest and enjoyed a lot. I think it has some problems:
1. You designed to evaluate children with UTI but you do not point UTI in the title.
2. It is well known that VUR is one of proposed etiologies for stones, so it is predictable that VUR be more prevalent in stone disease.
3. Your sample size is very small and so results will be in question.
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 major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 14 May 2020

Dear Author,
The manuscript requires a major revision.
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.

With Greetings

Revision 1:

REVIEWER No. 1:

I read the manuscript entitled as "Prevalence of Vesicoureteral Reflux in Children with and without Urolithiasis" with great interest and enjoyed a lot. I think it has some problems:

Comment 1:

Questions:

You designed to evaluate children with UTI but you do not point UTI in title

Answer:

We add UTI in title of Manuscript.

Comment 2:

Questions:

It is well known that VUR is one of proposed etiologies for stones, so it is predictable that VUR be more prevalent in stone disease.

Answer:

No, the UTI not evaluated in these articles and it is not mentioned in review or book.

Comment 3:

Questions:

Your sample size is very small and so results will be in question.

Answer:

The sample size was based on prevalence of VUR and Urolithiasis in children.

REVIEWER No. 2:

The organization of the data is presented well and information is conveyed to the reader. I had no major scientific issues, so I recommend the manuscript for acceptance.

Thanks

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) — 28 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
The authors have addressed all my comments/suggestions.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 22 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
With thanks to dear authors, it is now acceptable for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 22 Oct 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 Oct 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.