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.92642
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(4); e92642

Peer Review Report for "Proximal Crescentic Osteotomy Versus Proximal Opening Wedge Osteotomy of the First Metatarsal Bone in the Treatment of Moderate to Severe Hallux Valgus"

Author(s): Mohsen Mardani-Kivi, Mahmood Karimi, Keyvan Hashemi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 Apr 2019
Revised Date:	25 Aug 2019
Accepted Date:	28 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) — 8 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
This study is a good comparison between two different techniques for surgical treatment of moderate and severe hallux valgus deformity, but it seems to me there is need some more explanation and analysis in terms of biomechanical stability for (PCO) with two pins fixation and also no fixation for (POWO). The original procedures, described plate and screw fixation for both needs clarification.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 13 Jul 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
This study is a good comparison between two different techniques for surgical treatment of moderate and severe hallux valgus deformity, but it seems to me there is need some more explanation and analysis in terms of biomechanical stability for (PCO) with two pins fixation and also no fixation for (POWO). The original procedures, described plate and screw fixation for both needs for clarification.

Answers to reviewer comment:

Dear reviewers:

Authors are grateful for considering the manuscript as minor revision. About the issue concerning the reviewers, I have added the complete Coughlin's method to the material and method section of the manuscript. Thanks again for your time.

In the first group, the senior author performed all operative interventions according to the procedure described by Coughlin and Mann [10,11]. Through dorsal approach and using crescentic sawblade, a crescentic osteotomy with concave surface was done 1cm distal to the metatarso-cuneiform joint. The metatarsal shaft is rotated laterally and the osteotomy was kept using 2 smooth cross pins. The end of the pins was bent, placed under the skin and then removed after 6 weeks.

In the second group [10,12], longitudinal capsulotomy of the first MTP joint and excision of medial bunion was considered. After creating a medial midline incision from the base of the first metatarsus, an osteotomy of the base of 1st metatarsal was made perpendicular to the shaft with direction from dorsomedial to

plantarlateral. Since the lateral cortex of base of first metatarsus was intact and osteotomy place was filled with extracted autologous bunion bone of medial side, the surgical place was stable and pins were not applied except in 4 cases.

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)** 28 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.