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.91033
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(2); e91033

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Massage Therapy with or without Physical Exercises on the Weight of Premature Infants Admitted to the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit: A Randomized Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Sedighe Montaseri, Rokhsareh Barati, Mitra Edraki, Fariba Hemmati

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 25 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 6 Jul 2019
Accepted Date: 3 Aug 2019

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) — 18 May 2019

Dear EIC,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- In discussion, Please delete the same sentences that you used in results.
- Correct the grammar mistakes in discussion.(In the study of Lee et al. (2006), the aim of the study was to investigate the effect of massage…)
- Delete the second paragraph of conclusion and discuss it at the end of your limitations In discussion chapter.
- Delete the old references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 24 May 2019

Dear Author,
- Please add a consort flow diagram .
- There is need for other revisions as mentioned by AE.

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.

Associate Editor 1:	
Comments:	Answers:
- In discussion, Please delete the same sentences that you used in results.	Necessary changes were made. Line 161-162-164-174-175-195-196
- Correct the grammar mistakes in discussion.(In the study of Lee et al. (2006), the aim of the study was to investigate the effect of massage…)	Corrected Line 195-196
- Delete the second paragraph of conclusion and discuss it at the end of your limitations In discussion chapter.	Done Line 219-222
- Delete the old references.	Done Line: 261-264-268
EIC Decision:	
Comments:	Answers:
Please add consort flow diagram.	The consort flow diagram added to body of the article (Figure 1, Line 90). The figure comes at the end of the article.
Comments:	**Answers:**
Your manuscript does not follow the journal's standards; please correct your files according to the journal terms. Please write meaningful and complete sentences to explain each item and do not use ambiguous phrases such as "No" or "None Declared".	Correction made. Line 227-229
Please do not use “Commenting” and “Track Change” tools of Microsoft Office Word. The full manuscript file must be highlighted to indicate revised texts.	Necessary changes were made and just highlighted. No Track change is used.

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)** 3 Aug 2019

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