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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.97302
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 22(4); e97302

Peer Review Report for "Correlation Between Assisted Reproductive Outcomes and Paternal Age in Couples with Different Male Infertility Factors"

Author(s): Morvarid Akhavan, Rahman Iranidoost-Haghighi, Maryam Asgharnia, Fatemeh Ghasemian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 13 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 28 Oct 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Have you used the Chi-square test? I think, you just have used the Chi-square test.
- Please report exact p-values and instead of 0.000 report (< 0.001).
- In tables report number and percent (in parentheses) and p-values in a separate column.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
These comments recommended:
1. It is a better correlation to write than effect in the title
2. Type of study is cross-sectional, not prospective.
3. In this method full text, 4 groups men explain completely (Number of participants in each)group).
4. How confounding malefactors are controlled for example obesity.
5. the method Write in more detail.

6. In this tables number and present report
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Oct 2019

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,

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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:

Reviewer 1:
1. Have you used Chi-square test? I think, you just have used Chi-square test.
It was added in statistical analysis section.

2. Please report exact p-values and instead of 0.000 report (<0.001)
The exact p-value was added.

3. In tables report number and percent (in parenthesis) and p-values in a separate column.
The number and percent was written in the tables.

Reviewer 2:
Dear authors
these comments recommended:
1. It is better correlation to write than effect in the title
The title was revised according to this comment.

2. Type of study is cross-sectional not prospective.
It was done.

3. In this method full text, 4 groups men explain completely (Number of participants in each group).
The number of each group was added with more details.

4. How confounding male factors are controlled for example obesity.
There is no significant difference in the man BMI among groups and has been reported in the result section.

5. The method Write in more detail.
It was done.

6. In this tables number and present report
It was done.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 27 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

Alireza Bakhshipour: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Oct 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.