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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.108419
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: In Press(In Press); e108419

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Peritoneal Closure Versus Non-closure After Non-infected Elective Laparotomy with a Midline Incision: A Randomized Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Arash Mohammadi Tofigh, Mohammad Hossein Jafarzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 19 Jan 2021
Accepted Date: 24 Jan 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) — 23 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the author:
1. Talk about type of sampling and random allocation in the abstract.
2. Given information about sample size calculation are not enough. Also there was no reference.
3. Describe sampling method and procedure in details.
4. Describe random allocation step by step.
5. Display RCT flowchart.
6. In Table 1, 229.35 is not true for mean age.
7. Merge the last 2 Tables.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 28 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,

I've read the manuscript, This subject has been done previously and doesn't have any new point.
- Study has been organized appropriately
- I don't have any idea about statistic
The authors might talk about the new point of the study in the introduction of the manuscript.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 29 Oct 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.

Manuscript ID: 108419
Title: Comparison of peritoneal closure vs non-closure after non-infected elective laparotomy with a midline incision, a randomized clinical trial

Dear Sir

We appreciate the positive feedback from the reviewer and are grateful for their helpful comments in improving the manuscript and suggesting constructive comments. We have endeavored to reply to your comments as well as those offered by the reviewers. We would like to sincerely appreciate your kind consideration toward the publication of this work.

Sincerely,
Arash M. Tofigh

Department of general surgery
Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences
Tehran-Iran

Reply to the reviewer:

We thank the reviewers for the thorough reading of the manuscript and useful comments to improve the quality of this manuscript. Here we address the comments made by the reviewers, and the changes made in reply. We hope we have met your standards.

Reviews #1:

Reviewer : 1. Talk about type of sampling and random allocation in the abstract.

Authors: we added the sampling and random allocation in the abstract: line 3 and 4 of methods, abstract.

Reviewer: 2. Given information about sample size calculation are not enough. Also there was no reference.

Authors: We added the sample size calculation and the reference number in the sample size section of the methods and the formula as figure 1.

Reviewer: 3. Describe sampling method and procedure in details.

Authors: We added the sampling method and procedure in the sampling part of the methods.

Reviewer: 4. Describe random allocation step by step.

Authors: We describe the random allocation in details in the randomization part of the methods.

Reviewer: 5. Display RCT flowchart.

Authors: The RCT flow chart is available in the IRCT site under the number IRCT20200404046936N2.

Reviewer: 6. In Table 1, 229.35 is not true for mean age

Authors: We correct the table 1 .

Reviewer: 7. Merge the last 2 Tables.

Authors: We merged tables 3 and 4 as table 3.

Associate Editor 1:

Reviewer: Please talk about the new point of your study in introduction of your manuscript.

Authors : We added a paragraph to explain the novelty of our study at the end of the introduction part.

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) 18 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Display RCT flowchart.
2. Remove Figure 1.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 8 Jan 2021

Dear EIC,
Minor revision is needed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Jan 2021

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.

Manuscript ID: 108419

Title: Comparison of peritoneal closure vs non-closure after non-infected elective laparotomy with a midline incision, a randomized clinical trial

Dear Sir

We appreciate the positive feedback from the reviewer and are grateful for their helpful comments in improving the manuscript and suggesting constructive comments. We have endeavored to reply to your comments as well as those offered by the reviewers. We would like to sincerely appreciate your kind consideration toward the publication of this work.

Sincerely,

Reply to the reviewer:

We thank the reviewers for the thorough reading of the manuscript and useful comments to improve the quality of this manuscript. Here we address the comments made by the reviewers, and the changes made in reply. We hope we have met your standards.

Reviews #1:

1- Add RCT flowchart
   Answer: The study chart added as figure 1.
2- Delete figure 1
   Answer: The old figure 1 removed.

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 24 Jan 2021

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