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.86586
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 11(3); e86586

Peer Review Report for "Malnutrition in Hemodialysis Patients and Predicting Factors: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Author(s): Farahnaz Joukar, Zahra Moradi, Farideh Hasavari, Zahra Atrkar Roushan, Asieh Sedighi, Mehrnaz Asgharnezhad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	20 Nov 2018
Revised Date:	7 Apr 2019
Accepted Date:	10 May 2019

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) — 15 Mar 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is reviewed. logistic regression results in not enough and need more explanation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 16 Mar 2019

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.

In Reply to Associate Editor's Comments *that logistic regression results in not enough need more explanation: This statement was modified in this way:*

Enter method of logistic regression was used for analysis. with SPSS version 22 statistical package (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, USA) was used for analysis of data.

the logistic regression model was used for assessing probable predicting factor. Variable with p-value less than 0.2 chose as a possible factor. Enter method of logistic regression was used for analysis.In this study SPSS version 22 statistical packages (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, USA) was used for analysis of data.

- Q: [*that logistic regression results in not enough need more explanation*]
- R: [the logistic regression model was used for assessing probable predicting factor. Variable with p-value less than 0.2 chose as a possible factor. Enter method of logistic regression was used for analysis]

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 May 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 10 May 2019

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