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.93330
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(10); e93330

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Juxta-Apical Radiolucency as a Risk Factor for Inferior Alveolar Nerve Damage: A Cone-Beam Computed Tomography (CBCT) Study"

Author(s): Leila Khojastepour, Mohammad Ghasemi, Shabnam Rasti, Mahvash Hasani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 May 2020
Revised Date:	15 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	17 Jul 2020

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)

22 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The following suggestions/ recommendations should be included or corrected in the manuscript
1- The novelty of the research has been weakly stated and should be more specified. The authors are kindly requested to state the difference(s) of their research with the article with a similar conclusion.
2- The manuscript needs well English editing
3- The source of the sample size should be corrected. They were selected from 450 CBCT not panoramic radiography.
4- The conclusion should be based on and limited to the result of the present research. For example, the authors should have concluded that “In this study, most of the JARS were associated with IAN.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

23 Jun 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.

Q:1- The novelty of the research has been weakly stated and should be more specified. The authors are kindly requested to state the difference(s) of their research with the article with similar conclusion.

R: The last paragraph of introduction is completely revised and marked.

Q:2- The manuscript needs well English editing.

R: It has been edited and certificate is attached.

Q:3- The source of the sample size should be corrected. They were selected from 450 CBCT not panoramic radiography.

R: It is corrected in the text and highlighted.

Q:4- The conclusion should be based and limited to the result of the present research. For example, the authors should have concluded that “In this study most of the JARS were associated with IAN.
R: This section is revised and highlighted.

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)** 17 Jul 2020

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