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.99396
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: 12(1); e99396

Peer Review Report for "Using Ultra-Sonography in Acute and Chronic Renal Pathologies: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Author(s): Javad Jalili, Hamid Tayebi Khosroshahi , Abolhassan Shakeri Bavil Olyaei, Bagher Gharebaghi , Soroush Mostafavi , Armin Zarrintan , Mohammad Mirza-Aghazadeh-Attari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 10 Dec 2019
Accepted Date: 25 Jan 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is reviewed, the authors have brought so many relevant or irrelevant articles in the discussion. the aim of citation to other studies is explaining your findings. please use them in the interpretation of results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 6 Dec 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.

Dear Editor of NUM

On behalf of all of the authors I would like to thank you for your swift review of our manuscript and the effort put in to its review. Regarding the insightful comments made by the reviewers and the section editor, the current changes were made to the manuscript and highlighted with yellow in the original text of the manuscript:

1- Comment number 1 : *Associate Editor 1:*
the manuscript reviewed
the authors have brought so many relevant or irrelevant articles in the discussion. the aim of citation to other studies is explaining your findings. please use them in the interpretation of results.

Thank you again for your comment. As it can be seen the following comment was applied in the manuscript by adding more sentences after the studies mentioned which made them more relevant to our study. With each reference we made clear if the main findings of the study mentioned was in accordance or in contrast to our study. It was also mentioned that our findings were interpreted in regards to the acuteness or chronicity of the pathology and not the exact pathological classification of different conditions.

More so, the paragraph pertaining to karim et al. was deleted in order to obtain more cohesion. Reference 15 was also deleted in this regard.

I hope that the mentioned alterations are enough to guarantee the publication of this manuscript. I look forward to the editorial response and thank you again for all of your efforts in increasing the quality of our manuscript.

With Regards

The corresponding authors

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) 24 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is reviewed, it could be accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 Jan 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.