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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I enjoyed reading it, and I would like to offer my suggestions for its improvement:

1. Please use COREQ reporting guidelines and describe your methodology in full - how many themes and who identified them based on the notes and transcripts - have any been left out of the recommendations and why. Please also specify why notes or transcript of the meeting are not available in supplementary materials as well.

2. Abstract - Although the advice is directly mainly at editors - add aimed

3. Background - The second and third paragraph is a too long description of the authors already published work - It would be better to summarize it in only 1 sentence and direct the author to that publication, instead of repeating the points here in such length.

4. There have been many other studies and surveys on open peer review and they should be given the same amount of importance in the introduction as the authors own work, here I name a few:

   - Blinding in peer review: the preferences of reviewers for nursing journals
   - Nurse editors' views on the peer review process
   - Costs and Benefits of Reviewer Anonymity: A Survey of Journal Editors and Manuscript Reviewers
   - OpenAIRE Survey on Open Peer Review
   - Survey on open peer review: Attitudes and experience amongst editors, authors and reviewers
Who and why do researchers opt to publish in post-publication peer review platforms? - findings from a review and survey of F1000 Research

Report on ACL Survey on Preprint Publishing and Reviewing

5. In section 4, please provide references for those qualities of peer review you state it has, it would be beneficial to cite at least some of the 5 sys. Reviews of peer review that have been published so far. Having said that, I do not see the purpose of this paragraph at all, if, as stated in the abstract the main aim is to report findings from the stakeholder workshop, and provide guidance on implementation. I leave the decision to the editor, but would remove this section of the paper. And again, it reports on authors previous work. And therefore, mentioning authors name in third person seems inappropriate, rather state, as I (we) previously shown, suggested.

6. In section 5 methods and aims - The guidelines seek to be of use to those who oversee the peer review of manuscripts for publication who are considering introducing more transparency or inclusivity to their peer review processes by implementing any of the innovations grouped under the term "open peer review". Should be moved to end of section 1 introduction, while the text after it omitted.

7. Please provide sufficient details explaining the coding process of the answers, as well as the drafting of the first and later versions of recommendations, and how were the 3 questions transformed into 7+ recommendations.

8. Section 6.1. I would highly recommend the authors to provide a list or several examples, they themselves would use, on where those interested should look into the aspects they mention. Additionally, a supplementary table of such resources could be a great addition to the paper.

9. Please refrain from making statements like "will really help." Unless you provide (cite) studies that prove such actions help in the case of peer review.

10. "Consider starting with particular disciplines" Seems to be aimed at publishers of more journals, or interdisciplinary ones, please rephrase to be adaptable to even editors of single journals.

11. Section 6.3. - "It seems that researchers are far more favorable to the idea of open content of reports than open identities" - Please provide citations for this statement, also in light of some of the surveys I suggested above.
12. I would recommend the authors to reconsider their recommendation 6.3. in light of their aims - If the goal is implementation of OPR, as stated in 6.1. then a remark about possible compromise is better incorporated there, with the sentence on what aspect of OPR they want to implement, rather than including it as a separate recommendation.

13. Furthermore, 6.5. seems just a different approach of 6.2 I would recommend merging them.

14. Section 6.6. not all of them are positive - again please cite appropriate studies

15. Section 6.6. seems again just an extension of 6.2.

16. Section 6.7. It seems contra-productive that setting a goal is the last stage - reevaluate the goal in light of all learned, perhaps, but setting the goas as stated in your first sentence is already in 6.1.

17. Section 7.1. - there is no need to repeat - you could start small with a pilot - that is already one of your advices that you mentioned above.

18. In section 7.1. do mention Publons as keeping reward track or even elseviers review recognition platform.

19. Please greatly expand your conclusion section, and list the limitations of your recommendations. Especially, how you view your recommendations compared to guideline development or Delphi method.

20. Overall, I feel the article could use a through rewriting. Perhaps it would be helpful for the authors if they made a step by step recommendation to the editors and publishers as a list of 10 or as many as needed one sentence steps to reshape and strengthen what the authors want to say, ideally in a form of a table/flowchart, or checklist like format, as I feel the article suffers from many redundancies, and not a clear set up of what an interested editor/publisher should do. Additionally, if the point of introduction was to stress the importance of the terms - then they should be one of the steps of the recommendations - do your homework - which would include knowing the differences between open identities, reports, and so on. Finally, if any differences are there for publisher/editor considerations these should be made clear. And also the target group should be stated in the title of the article as well. As an example of what I would personally like to see:
A) Set a open peer review goal

A1. Acquaint your self with differences between open reports, identities. etc.

A2. Decide which or all do you plan to implement and when

B) Communicate your goal with the stakeholders and research community

B2. Consider running survey on their opinions and/or methods of full/partial implementation and so on….

21. I also find it strange that there is no mention of checking of spelling or hate speech or any other editing of open reports before their publication, nor references to current practices in regards to those sections. As well as the structure of the reports themselves (open format, checklists and etc.). Also, a note should be made on confidential comments to the editor and what role they play in light of open reports.

22. Additionally, I would like the recommendations or comments (either in recommendations or discussion section) on timeline for implementation.

23. As minor comment - consider also stating that Open pre-review manuscripts are often called green open access, and alert users to the list of all know preprint servers and discussion surrounding pre-prints.

In hopes may comments can help you improve your manuscript,

Kind regards,

Mario Malicki
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