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.115829
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: In Press(In Press); e115829

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the Relationship Between Body Mass Index (BMI) and DNA Fragmentation Index Changes in Primary Infertile Patients Following Microscopic Sub Inguinal Varicocelectomy"

Author(s): Mohamadreza Dadfar, Alireza Kheradmand, Hayat Mombeini , Javad Mohammadi Asl, Abbas Mahdavian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	15 May 2021
Revised Date:	15 Jun 2021
Accepted Date:	30 Jul 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) 10 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
I read the above mentioned manuscript with great interest and enjoyed a lot; but unfortunately it has some problems that should be answered by dear authors:
1. It needs English revision by an English spoken editor
2. All abbreviations should be addressed in full for the first time; for example DFI
3. Exclusion criteria is not fit; for example any radiation (occupational or any other form of irradiation) can increase DFI
4. Table 1 does not show any relationship and is a description of variables
5. In table 2, range of variables (minimum and maximum) should be addressed
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,

The authors should revise as reviewer wishes.

Thanks.

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

11 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,

This article 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.

Ref.: Ms. No. **115829**

Evaluation of the Relationship between Body Mass Index (BMI) and DNA" Fragmentation Index Changes in Primary Infertile Patients Following "Microscopic Sub Inguinal Varicocelectomy

In **Nephro-Urology Monthly**

Dear Prof,

Thanks you in advance for your kind attention, here in I've mentioned some corrections and comments:

- Language and grammar of the text edited and shows with red color.

Reviewer #1:

1. All abbreviations are being addressed in full for first time. It is corrected in all text.

2. Exclusion criteria included: previous surgical history, pregnancy history, history of abortion, history of chemotherapy, trauma and diabetes, *radiation and radiography* and other underlying diseases. (In 3rd page)

Which, in third paragraph of 8th page," The selected statistical population was 100 patients with primary infertility with varicocele who were candidates for surgery and were evaluated with no exclusion criteria".

3. Table 1 is a description of variables. It is corrected in text.

4. In table 2, range of variables (minimum and maximum) is addressed and shows with red color.

In addition to these comments, I've attached the final version of my paper, please, be kind enough to study and review it once more, looking forward to get your reply.

Sincerely yours

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) — 26 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
I read the revised manuscript and learned too much, I think it is now proper for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 26 Jul 2021

Dear EIC,
It is acceptable for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 30 Jul 2021

Dear Authors,
It is suitable for publication.
Thanks.