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.99800
Published in: Nephro-Urology Monthly: In Press(In Press); e99800

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Re-TUR Results in Primary Patients with Non-muscle-Invasive Bladder Cancer (NMIBC) of Low, Intermediate-, and High-risk for Recurrence Based on the EORTC Scoring System"

Author(s): Farhood Khaleghi mehr, Pejman Shadpour, Hossein Shahrokh, Nima Narimani , Maryam Abolhasani, Mohsen Shati

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	14 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	7 Feb 2021

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) 19 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript entitled as above and enjoyed it a lot; I think it needs some corrections that should be addressed by the authors:
1. English revision by an English spoken editor
2. All abbreviations should be explained for the first time
3. Sample size is too small and no conclusion can be extracted from this small group.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise their manuscript as the reviewers wish.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 19 Apr 2020

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.

Date: Dec 10, 2020

Editors of the Nephro Urology Monthly Journal

Subj: Revision of original manuscript 99800

Dear Professor Einollahi,

The reviewers had kindly and positively commented on our manuscript:

1. Their call for English editing was obliged.
2. All abbreviations are now given in expanded format upon first mention.
3. As summarily called for, "a major revision of the original submission" on the account that it "needed **more patients** to be conclusive" has been addressed.

   Our analysis now includes more than double the original number of studied patients, collected over part of this interval. We made the best of our delay in submitting this revision, to enrol additional patients and re analyse the entire data to comply with the reviewer's suggestion.

   We acknowledge that sample size may *appear* as a limitation in this report, but the exceptional value of these findings, derived from selecting ***only primary non recurrent*** patients, justifies publication. Primary TCC patients (just diagnosed and yet untreated) comprise less than 17% of the patient load at any urology service, and accumulating such a cohort, while ensuring that all procedures are done by a single surgeon, would take many years even at the largest referral centers, like ours.

Sincerely,

(Corresponding author):

P Shadpour MD

Professor of Urology

Hasheminejad Kidney Center (HKC),

Hospital Management Research Center (HMRC),

Iran University of Medical Sciences (IUMS)

Corresponding Author: **P Shadpour MD, Hasheminejad Kidney Center (HKC); Vanak Sq, Tehran, 19697, Iran. Tel. 00982122272274, Fax. 00982188644447, pshadpour@gmail.com; pshadpour@iums.ac.ir**

Total number of pages: **12**

Total number of Tables: **2**

Total number of Images: 0

Word counts

for the abstract: 251

for the text: 2722

Acknowledgements: The authors are indebted to our department staff who generously contributed their time and support to this study.

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) 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
With great thanks for the authors' patience, it is now proper for publishing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 6 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
I agree with the reviewers for accepting the above-mentioned manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Feb 2021

Dear Author,
It is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.