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.112638
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 13(3); e112638

Peer Review Report for "Erectile Dysfunction and Infertility: A Pilot Study in Male Partners of Infertile Couples"

Author(s): Son Trinh The, Su Hoang Xuan, Ai Hoang Van, Trinh Nguyen Ba, Hoang Le, Trang Quan Van, Minh Pham Duc, Tung Nguyen Thanh, Tuan Ngo Anh, Trang Vu Thi Thu, Quyet Do, Binh Do Nhu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 7 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 18 Mar 2021

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) — 8 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The study is interesting and is well designed, but I have a few suggestions
- Please remove mean ± SD" of Variables section in table 1 and 2
- Do not use Italic format in tables like 3
- please arrange the inclusion and exclusion criteria on methods
- lines 60-63 should be inserted "REFERENCES"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 21 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled as "Erectile dysfunction and Infertility: A pilot study in male partners of infertile couples" with great interest and enjoyed a lot but I think it needs some revisions:
1. Grammatical revision
2. Explain exclusion criteria in proper section

3. Edit references
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
This article needs minor revision as reviewers wish.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 26 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
This article requires a Minor 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.

Answer the questions for reviewer 1

I read the manuscript entitled as "Erectile dysfunction and Infertility: A pilot study in male partners of infertile couples" with great interest and enjoyed a lot but I think it needs some revisions:

#1. Grammatical revision

Thank you for your comment. We have improved the revised MS and corrected some grammatical errors.

#2. Explain exclusion criteria in proper section

Thank you for your suggestion. We have added the exclusion criteria in the revised MS from lines 81-83.

#3. Edit references

Thank you for your comment. We have downloaded the Vancouver-Kowsar 2018 style and improved the references. We also added two new references from lines 60-63 and rearranged the order of all the references.

Answer the questions for reviewer 2

The study is interesting and is well designed, but I have a few suggestions:

#1. Please remove ''mean ± SD'' of Variables section in table 1 and 2.

Thank you for your comment. We have removed all the "mean ± SD" of the variables section in Tables 1 and 2 as your suggestion.

#2. No use Italic format in tables like 3

Thank you for your suggestion. We did exclude all the Italic format forms in Table 3.

#3. Please arrange the inclusion and exclusion criteria on methods

Thank you for your comment. We have added the exclusion criteria along with the inclusion criteria in the revised MS from lines 81-83.

#4. Lines 60-63 should be inserted ''REFERENCES''

Thank you for your comment. We have added two new references from lines 60-63 (reference numbers 12 and 13) and rearranged the order of all the references.

12. Bell R, Pham TT, JJoFBM. *Modelling the knowledge transfer process between founder and successor in Vietnamese family businesses succession. 2020.*

13. McLeod MW, Dieu NT, Nguyen TD. *Culture and customs of Vietnam. Greenwood Publishing Group; 2001.*

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) 17 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the author's patience and cooperation, I think the manuscript is ready for publishing now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
It is accepted for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,
It is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.