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.58135
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 10(2); e58135

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Clopidogrel on Longevity of Permanent Double-Lumen Catheter Patency in Dialysis Patients: A Single-Blind Placebo-Controlled Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Mohamad Mozafar, Arash Moradi, Mohammad Mozafar, Majid Alborzi, Arash Moradi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 9 Aug 2017
Revised Date: 16 Oct 2017
Accepted Date: 28 Nov 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Oct 2017

Dear EIC,
The manuscript reviewed. it's good and practical for physicians but I didn't understand finally, are the authors recommended clopidogrel for all patients who have permcath or just for high-risk patients? is it cost effective for all patients?
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 12 Oct 2017

Dear Author,
It 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.

Dear sir/Madam

We added a sentence “Therefore, we suggest prescription of clopidogrel for all patients whom underwent permcath insertion ” in the discussion and highlighted .

All of our patients that candidate for permcath insertion are high-risk because they are unsuitable for AVF or synthetic graft .

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) 27 Nov 2017

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Nov 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.