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.91140
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 11(3); e91140

Peer Review Report for "Epididymal Metastasis of Cholangiocarcinoma, an Extremely Rare Event: A Case Report and Review of the Literature"

Author(s): Bita Geramizadeh, Leila Karami, Azalia Aminzadeh, Kurosh Kazemi, Alireza Shamsaeefar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	2 Mar 2019
Revised Date:	14 May 2019
Accepted Date:	10 Jun 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 20 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled "Epididymal Metastasis of Cholangiocarcinoma, An extremely rare event. A Case Report and Review of the Literature" very interested and enjoyed a lot but i have some questions:
1. Why you did not test AFP, HCG, and LDH?
2. What did a chest CT scan show?
3. Did you request an abdominopelvic CT scan?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 20 Mar 2019

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)** 21 Mar 2019

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 Editor-in-chief

I’m so grateful to change my manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments.

1) Why you did not test AFP, HCG and LDH? We evaluated the patient’s clinical chart. These markers have been all performed which has been added to the text.

2) What did chest CT scan show? Chest Ct scan has been performed , normal (added to the text)

3. Did you request abdominopelvic CT scan? Abdominopelvic CT scan has been normal (added to the text)

Best 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) — 22 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
My comments for improvement are minor as follows.
It is a nice effort to report a rarely diagnosed epididymal metastasis of cholangiocarcinoma.
- Please put a nice picture for Figure1 so that the mass in the upper pole of the kidney in the figure can be readable.
- I strongly recommend employing a native English writer to rewrite the whole manuscript on behalf of the authors and then resubmit it to the journal.
- The quality of scientific English writing is very poor.
- Please develop a conclusion paragraph that reiterates the case and what can be learned.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 28 Apr 2019

Dear AE,
With thanks to the authors, i read the revised manuscript again and enjoyed a lot but it needs an English language edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 28 Apr 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 29 Apr 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 (2)

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 Editor-in-chief

I’m so grateful to change my manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments.

1) English revision has been done by native English speaker.

2) Unfortunately the ultrasonogram has been done in a community hospital before surgery and we don’t have any other picture.

Best Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 27 May 2019

Dear AE,
After revision, the organization of the data is presented well and information is conveyed to the reader. The manuscript has been appropriately modified, and all of my previously articulated concerns have been addressed. I had no major scientific issues, so I recommend the manuscript for acceptance.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 8 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 8 Jun 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 10 Jun 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.