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.14264
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 10(1); e14264

Peer Review Report for "Adipsic Diabetes Insipidus: A Single-Center Case Series"

Author(s): Seyed Mahmoud Ramak Hashemi, Mahsa Akhtar, foroogh sabzghabaei, reza mollahoseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 May 2017
Revised Date: 25 Aug 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) — 16 Jun 2017

Dear AE,
The manuscript reviewed. after revision it could be considerable for publishing.
1- The other reasons for polyuria such as electrolyte disturbance (hypokalemia, hypercalcemia, glycosuria,.... must be ruled out.
2- Conclusion must be related just own your results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jun 2017

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 16 Jun 2017

Dear Author,
It requires a revision as the reviewers' request.
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.

Dear reviewers

Thank you for reading and reviewing our article.

As you commented we have revised all segments, describe about other causes of diabetes insipidus and complete the conclusion.

The article has been edited by kowsar group. The references has been revised.

Despite rarity this topic is so important and interesting and we hope that you accepted it for publishing in this valuable journal.

Regards. Dr Sabzghabaei

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 could be scheduled for publishing.
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.