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.116278
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: In Press(In Press); e116278

Peer Review Report for "Adverse Effects of Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) Vaccine"

Author(s): Hamid Reza Samimagham, Mehdi Hassani Azad, Dariush Hooshyar, Mohsen Arabi, Zahra Reza Hosseini, Mitra Kazemi Jahromi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 May 2021
Revised Date: 7 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 10 Jun 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: EIC | **Revision** (0)

23 May 2021

Dear Authors,
The topic is of interest however the number of cases is too small and it is a single center study on a special group. If it could be revised to a letter , it may be reconsidered for possible publication .
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

Thank you very much for your email dated regarding the preliminary revision of our manuscript entitled "**Adverse Reactions of Gam-COVID-vac (Sputnik V) Vaccine** "and the opportunity to revise and resubmit the manuscript. We have complied with all reviewers' comments and hope that the manuscript is now suitable for publication in **"Shiraz E-Medical Journal"**

Looking forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1:

EIC Decision:

The topic is of interest however the number of cases are too small and it is a single center study on a special group . If it could be revised to a letter , it may be reconsidered for possible publication .

A:We changed the format of the manuscript to a letter.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 5 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
To be considered as a letter the article should be shortened according to the standards of the journal.
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

Thank you very much for your email dated regarding the preliminary revision of our manuscript entitled "**Adverse Reactions of Gam-COVID-vac (Sputnik V) Vaccine** "and the opportunity to revise and resubmit the manuscript. We have complied with all reviewers' comments and hope that the manuscript is now suitable for publication in **"Shiraz E-Medical Journal"**

Looking forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Corresponding Author

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1:

EIC Decision:

To be considered as a letter the article should be shortened according to the standards of the journal.

Answer 1:

We shortened the article according to the standards of the journal so that it can be considered as a letter.

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) 10 Jun 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.