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

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.103624
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 10(2); e103624

Peer Review Report for "Endoscopic Neuromodulation of Suprascapular Nerve in Chronic Shoulder Pain: A Case Report"

Author(s): Marco Divizia, Giorgio Germani, Ignazio Urti, Farnad Imani, Giustino Varrassi, Stefano Meloncelli

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 15 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Apr 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) 14 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I read the submitted manuscript and it need some corrections as below:
- Name and brand of electro catheter
- For stimulation setting: Did you do sensory and motor stimulation before performing PRF? And what was your technique? And what was your target?
- Name of RF Generator
- For Shoulder Pain and Disability Index (SPADI): Describe a little more about what is this index and its units for pain and disability, or put a table. Is the base of pain 0-10? or 0-100? And what is the unit of disability index?
- Why the unit of VAS for pain score (Tab 1) and for SPADI (Tab 2) is different? the first was based on 0-10, and for SPADI is based on 0-100
- Recommend considering the four below references.
Imani F, Varrassi G. Ketamine as Adjuvant for Acute Pain Management, Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(6):e100178
Sluijter ME, Imani F. Evolution and Mode of Action of Pulsed Radiofrequency. Anesth Pain

Med. 2013;2(4):139-41.
Imani F. Using Pulsed Radiofrequency for Chronic Pain. Anesth Pain Med. 2012;1(3):155-6.
Malik K M, Beckerly R, Imani F. Musculoskeletal Disorders a Universal Source of Pain and Disability Misunderstood and Mismanaged: A Critical Analysis Based on the U.S. Model of Care, Anesth Pain Med. 2018;8(6):e85532.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 14 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewer comments this manuscript needs minor revision.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 14 Apr 2020

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.

April 14, 2020

Dear Editor in Chief
Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine

Here you have the answers to the reviewer and also were yellow highlighted at the text:

Q1: Name and brand of electro catheter
R: Electrocatheter VoJager by Alfamed.

Q2: For stimulation setting: Did you do sensory and motor stimulation before performing PRF? And what was your technique? And what was your target?
R: Even if the nerve was under our eyes, we used electro-stimulation to be sure. We looked after a radiating pain sensation in the anterior part of the shoulder. The test was considered good when radiating pain was generated at 0.3 mA.

Q3: Name of RF Generator
R: PRF generator used in this case was the BMC by Baylis Industry.

Q4: For Shoulder Pain and Disability Index (SPADI): Describe a little more about what is this index and its units for pain and disability, or put a table. Is the base of pain 0-10? or 0-100? And what is the unit of disability index?
R: The SPADI used was the one enclosed, whose scale is 1-130.

Q5: Why the unit of VAS for pain score (Tab 1) and for SPADI (Tab 2) is different? the first was based on 0-10, and for SPADI is based on 0-100
R: This explains the differences between the 2 tables results.

Q6: Recommend to consider four below references.
R: Recommended references were added

Kind regards

Prof Giustino Varrassi

Corresponding Author:
Giustino Varrassi
E-mail: giuvarr@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-3822-2923
Author ID:7005736555

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)** 14 Apr 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.