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.113358
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 13(2); e113358

Peer Review Report for "Application of Selenium Nanoparticles on Sperm Quantity Indicators in Wistar Rat"

Author(s): Ebrahim Talebi, Habibeh Ghazanfarpour, Reyhane Ghazanfarpoor, Salim Bouchentouf, Maryam Khosravinezhad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 10 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) — 18 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
The topic is interesting and findings well planed but paper needs to be native expert ,some sentences read hardly and unreadable, methods should be described completely on details discussion updates with previous studies and compare results and also,I recommend to adding significant conclusion,finally correct more defects created in references and update them based style journal
Thanks

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

Dear AE,
I read the above-mentioned manuscript and enjoyed it a lot but unfortunately, it has some problems that should be corrected by the authors before publishing:
1. It needs grammatical edition by an English spoken editor
2. Material and methods need more explanation
3. Discussion section is not written properly and should be completed as standard
4. Consider journal format and sections.

Thanks.

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

21 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise as reviewers' wish.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

26 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
It 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.

Reviewer 1:

I read the above mentioned manuscript and enjoyed a lot but unfortunately it has some problems that should be corrected before publishing:

1. It needs grammatical edition by an English spoken editor *(*At the suggestion of the respected Reviewer 1, the grammar editing was done by an English editor*)*
2. Material and methods needs more explanation*(*To the materials and methods section, Laboratory animals and rearing house on line 79, Animal grouping on line 95, Animal care conditions on line 105 and Ethical Consideration on line 135 were added and expanded*)*.

3. Discussion section is not written properly and should be completed as standard (In addition to adding Correlation and Regression equations in line 189,I also rewrote and edited the discussion section and it was completed as standard).
4. Consider journal format and sections *(*In addition to adding Ethical Consideration in a separate section on line 135, I also fixed the article references by inserting the DOI. The Correlation and Regression equations section from lines 189 to 207 was added to the results. Also, tables 1 and 5 and pictures 1 and 3 were added to add more information).

Reviewer 2:

Topic is interesting and findings well planed but paper needs to be native expert ,some sentences read hardly and unreadable (At the suggestion of the respected Reviewer 2, the grammar editing was done by helping an native English editor), methods should be described completely on details

Discussion updates with previous studies and compare results and also, I recommend to adding significant conclusion, finally correct more defects created in references and update them based style journal (Due to the valuable comment of Reviewer 2, the contents of the article were updated and compare the results. In the conclusion section, I tried to present a more appropriate conclusion by using correlation analysis and regression equations)

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,
I read the revised manuscript and enjoyed a lot and i think it is now proper for publishing.
Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,
It is now acceptable for publishing.
Thanks.

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

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.