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.99178
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(1); e99178

Peer Review Report for "Is There a Link Between Saphenofemoral Insufficiency and Varicocele: Imaging Study of Sub-Fertile Men"

Author(s): Sina Farhadi , Javad Jalili, Abolhassan Shakeri Bavil Olyaei, Amin Arasteh , Mohammad Mirza-Aghazadeh-Attari, Armin Zarrintan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	9 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	15 Feb 2020

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) — 31 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The article is suitable for the journal and can be interesting for readers.However, I have some minor suggestions.
- Please identify a proficient English reader and writer to proof the manuscript as, in its current format, it is often inpenetrable and confusing. Also, I suggest that authors check very carefully the Formatting Guide to Authors for example.
- Please remove"objective" from background.
- In part methods could you please add Human Ethics in the first line of method NOT in the end?
- Please use standard correct on Mean and SD"32/4 ± 8/44" modify to "32.4 ± 8.44" and etc and even mention it on table.
- Use abbrevation 'SFI'.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 Feb 2020

Dear AE,

I read the above-mentioned manuscript and enjoyed it alot. I think it can be published in journal but at first it need a grammatical edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 1 Feb 2020

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 (0)** 1 Feb 2020

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.

Dear Editor of NUM

We thank you for your reconsideration of our manuscript. We would like to let you know that we are grateful for the comments of the respectable reviewers, and based on their suggestions, the following alterations were made in the manuscript:

Reviewer number one:

Comment: *Please identify a proficient English reader and writer to proof the manuscript as, in its current format, it is often inpenetrable and confusing*.

Response: We had one of our colleagues with native level English fluency revise the manuscript (Dr, Mohammad Naghavi Behzad – Danish institute of clinical research). The alterations in the manuscript are highlighted with yellow.

Comment: *Also, I suggest that authors check very carefully the Formatting Guide to Authors for example Please remove''objective'' from background*

Response: The requested alterations were made.

Comment: *n part methods could you please add Human Ethics in the first line of method NOT in the end*

Response: The requested changes were made.

Comment: *Please use standard correct on Mean and SD''32/4 ± 8/44'' modify to ''32.4 ± 8.44'' and etc and even mention it on table*

Response: The requested changes were made and it was also mentioned in the table that the values represented Mean +/- standard deviation

Comment: *Use abbreviation 'SFI'*

Response: The requested changes were made.

Reviewer number two:

Comment: I read the above mentioned manuscript and enjoyed alot. I think it can be published in journal but at first it need a grammatical edition.

Response: We had one of our colleagues with native level English fluency revise the manuscript (Dr, Mohammad Naghavi Behzad – Danish institute of clinical research). The alterations in the manuscript are highlighted with yellow.

Finally I would like to thank you and the reviewers again and hope that the manuscript will be acceptable in its current format.

With Regards

The corresponding author

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) 14 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
I read the revised version of the above-mentioned manuscript and I think it is now proper for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 14 Feb 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Feb 2020

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