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.87925
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 11(2); e87925

Peer Review Report for "Electrolyte Disturbances in PICU: A Cross Sectional Study"

Author(s): Simin Sadeghi-Bojd, Noor Mohammad Noori, Elham Damani, Alireza Teimouri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Dec 2018
Revised Date: 9 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) — 4 Jan 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is reviewed:
At the end of the paper, you concluded: 'hyperkalemia was significantly higher in children with diuretic use than in other children"
1- Which kind of diuretics mostly administer in the pediatric field.
2- Mean creatinine data is mandatory for a better conclusion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 4 Jan 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.

Reply to reviewers

Associate Editor 1:
the manuscript reviewed
at the end of the paper, you concluded: 'hyperkalemia was significantly higher in children with diuretic use than in other children"
1- which kind of diuretics mostly administer in pediatric filed.

Furosemide
2- mean creatinine data is mandatory for a better conclusion.

Based on this sentence" Creatinine means were 0.60±0.22, 0.61±0.19 and 1.28±0.55 in hypokalemia, Normal and hyperkalemia respectively". We add "The main reason probably is due to higher creatinine in hyperkalemia" in conclusion.

- The list of authors in the current revision is different from Revision 0. Please note that any **"Authorship Changes"** (i.e., order, addition, and deletion of authors) after initial submission should be approved by all authors. **Any such changes made after a manuscript has been submitted should be explained to the journal.** For more information about the journal policy regarding "Authorship Changes" see the following link.
- **Authorship orders modified based on the first version that submitted.**

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.