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.80269
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 10(5); e80269

Peer Review Report for "Hypospadias Reconstructive Surgery Modification Using Double Layer Urethral Stent"

Author(s): Ahmad Mohammadipor, Reza Shojaeian, Parisa Saeedi Sharifabad, Mehran Hiradfar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Jun 2018
Revised Date: 31 Aug 2018
Accepted Date: 3 Sep 2018

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) 9 Jul 2018

Dear AE,
I read the above mentioned manuscript highly interested and enjoyed a lot; i think it is a new idea and should be completed in future. it has some problems that should be solved before publishing:
1. Needs English correction.
2. Explain about your methods more.
3. Are your surgery method the same in all patients?
4. Are used urethral catheter the same in all patients (caliber, manufaturer and ....)?
5. Figures are not good, use original figures.
6. Explain your results very completely and then summarize them in tables.
7. Discussion should be written more completely.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by

the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

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

9 Jul 2018

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to 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 editorial board of Journal of pediatric urology

Thank you for the reviewer helpful comments of my article as" **Hypospadias reconstructive surgery modification using double layer urethral stent**"

Article revision took about six months as I decide to add some more cases that were completed their fallow up during recent months. I sent the article to a colleague who is working in an English speaking country for writing and grammatical corrections.

This submission is my revised article where the article underwent major revisions.

The English writing is edited by a scientific editor.

More cases are added and the results are presented in detaile.

The discussion is completed.

Type of catheter and surgical procedure are explained clearly.

The method also explain more completely

Figure 2 is improved in quality.

All reviewer's comments are revised and they are seen in red color.

With regards

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) 2 Sep 2018

Dear AE,
At first, I want to thanks dear authors for their patience.
I read the revised version and now it is completely suitable for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 2 Sep 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 Sep 2018

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