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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.95198
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(6); e95198

Peer Review Report for "Sleeve Gastrectomy vs. Fundus Resection in Bariatric Surgery (Animal Study)"

Author(s): Alimohammad Bananzadeh, Seyed Vahid Hosseini, Hajar Khazraei, Mohammad Mehdi Lashkarizadeh, Leila Ghahramani, Seyed Mohammad Kazem Tadayon, Mozhdeh Zamani, Zahra Zabangirfard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 17 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 18 Mar 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary.
2. Sample size is not clear in the abstract.
3. Did you use Wilcoxon test and Mann-Whitney U test (abstract) or Kruskal-walis test (statistical methods)?
4. Appropriate descriptive statistics for non-parametric tests are median (IQR).
5. Report findings quantitatively using descriptive statistics.
6. In Table 1 also compare groups at each time.
7. Using the Kruskal-walis test for within-group comparisons is not true.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 2 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Mar 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.

Reply to the comments

1. Reporting exact P-value in the text is necessary. *Ok, it is changed.*
2. Sample size is not clear in the abstract. *21 rabbits divided to three groups (n=7)*
3. Did you use Wilcoxon test and Mann-Withney U test (abstract) or Kruskal-walis test (statistical methods)? Kruskal-walis test for comparison of the means between the groups and the difference after months in one group was assayed by Friedman test.
4. Appropriate descriptive statistics for non-parametric tests are median (IQR). *Ok, it is changed.*
5. Report findings quantitatively using descriptive statistics. *Ok, we reported data in Tables by median (IQR).*
6. In Table 1 also compare groups at each time. *OK, it is added.*
7. Using Kruskal-walis test for within group comparisons is not true. Yes, we was assayed by Friedman test.

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)** 18 Mar 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.