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.14252
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 10(1); e14252

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Acupressure at the Point of Hugo on Pain Severity of Needle Insertion in Arteriovenous Fistulas in Hemodialysis Patients"

Author(s): Hossien Mahjub, Seyed Reza Borzou, Gholam-Hosein Falahinia, Seyed Reza Borzou, Sophia Akbari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Jul 2017
Revised Date:	3 Oct 2017
Accepted Date:	12 Oct 2017

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)

11 Aug 2017

Dear AE,
The manuscript reviewed. there are some problems in article a few of them would be mentioned as following:
1- The authors mentioned "Data were collected in by a questionnaire and checklist that consists of two parts: The first partincludes demographic information and information about the history of hemodialysis such as age, sex, marital status, education level, occupation, smoking and medical history current, because
hemodialysis, treatment with hemodialysis, duration of fistula and aneurysm in the artery." but there aren't any information about these data.
2- The results section is not attractive for publishing. the main results must be bolded in this section.
3- Conclusion must be depended on just your results.
so, the manuscript needs a major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Aug 2017

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs a revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Aug 2017

Dear Author,

It requires a major revision as reviewer's comments.

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.

In the name of God

According to the reviwer comments :

1- Demographic information was mentioned in the article(table1).
2- The results were clearly expressed(table 2).
3- The article's discussion section was corrected.
4- The article's references was revised.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 10 Oct 2017

Dear EIC,
Now it might be acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Oct 2017

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