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.103332
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 13(1); e103332

Peer Review Report for "The Pattern of Day Case (Ambulatory) Percutaneous (PCNL): A Descriptive Retrospective Study from a Tertiary Care Hospital"

Author(s): Rehan Fareed, Huma Shamim

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 7 Nov 2020
Accepted Date: 7 Feb 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

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.

Reviewer 1. Thanks for review sir.

This is a retrospective study considering the last 3 years cases. Our aim is only to describe the pattern of day case PCNL. Foe descriptive single center study, 210 cases are enough to describe the pattern. In this retrospective study we have included our confirmed cases so no control possible. Our aim is only to describe the pattern that is why we have not established any association.

Thank you, sir

Reviewer 2: Thanks for review sir

This is a retrospective study considering the last 3 years cases. As per suggestion we have changed the title of study. We have also updated the table and results section. Statistical analysis section added in the article.

Thank you, sir

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.