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.81471
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 10(5); e81471

Peer Review Report for "A Rare Case of Urachal Adenocarcinoma: Long Term Follow Up"

Author(s): Mohammad Reza Darabi, Ali Reza Khoei, Atena Aghaee, Salman Soltani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Jun 2018
Revised Date: 11 Aug 2018
Accepted Date: 21 Aug 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) — 7 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
I read the above-mentioned manuscript highly interested and enjoyed it a lot but it has a few problems that should be corrected:
1. Needs English edition.
2. Discussion is too short.
3. It is better to have a review of the literature.
4. Why you have decided to deny adjuvant therapy?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 7 Aug 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript should be revised based on reviewers' wishes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 7 Aug 2018

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this

document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

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.

Greetings

The manuscript is changed according to all the reviewers comment.

Why you have decided denying adjuvant therapy?

1. *There is no definite guild line about this rare disease.*
2. *We mention some article in discussion that benefit of adjuvant chemoradiation is debated .and it is not proved to increase the overall survival of patients .*
3. *Most studies recommend close follow up and perform adjuvant therapy in case of local or distant recurrences.*

With respect.

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) — 21 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
Thanks for authors patience, I think it is now acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 21 Aug 2018

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled as above is now proper for publishing as a case report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 21 Aug 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.