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

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.106623
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 10(5); e106623

Peer Review Report for "Mental Stress in Anesthesia and Intensive Care Physicians During COVID-19 Outbreak"

Author(s): Hassan Ali, Ahmed Abdelaziz Ismail, Ahmed Abdalwahab

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 11 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 14 Aug 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)

21 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
General Comments:
Thanks for the opportunity to review the article.
This article deals with mental stress among anesthesiologists and anesthesiologist-intensivists at the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic based on a survey. Hence, the questionnaire could have been different in the middle of a pandemic, moreover, all the predictors of clinician anxiety have not been taken into account. (Ref: Fleisher LA et al: NEJM Catalyst Vol. No. | July 8, 2020 DOI: 10.1056/CAT.20.0270).
However, it is still providing some insight on an account of stress related to Covid19
Specific comments:
- Philosophical sentences (lines 34-36) should be avoided in scientific articles.
- Questionnaire figures: may be avoided; only questions could be put inside one box/table
- Table 2: Inadequate training on donning and doffing is statistically significant (p=0.017); needs to be discussed
- Figure 8 is the repetition of the text
- Preventive and possible treatment measures for severe mental stress need to be discussed.
- Similar articles already published need to be discussed along with highlighting the

important take-home message for this manuscript
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The study is a survey conducted amongst anesthesiologists and intensivists. The author has collected feedback about the perceived stresses during the covid pandemic. There are minor issues with language which needs attention and are highlighted in the attached document. The feedback from the survey suggests that most of the caregivers have a lot of stress. However, as what is seen, 98% of the caregivers were not or were occasionally involved in covid patient care- suggesting that the fear perceived was not factual.
The current manuscript can be strengthened by repeating the survey amongst the same group of caregivers after a time frame, reflecting the benefits of awareness of the current pandemic in allying the stress associated with the pandemic. This would add more weight to the current manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 31 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The article entitled: 'Mental Stress in Anesthesia and Intensive Care physicians during the COVID-19 outbreak', is a cross sectional survey of physicians in Egypt. It concerns mental stressors among frontline anesthesia critical care practitioners actively dealing with COVID patients. This is an area of study that has not received much attention in a systematic manner during this pandemic. So this is an important study to better understand the mind set of frontline workers and their psychological needs. It is very well written, the design is appropriate and comprehensive. The tables are clear. The survey instrument used in the study is appropriate. The sample size and response rate sufficient to draw conclusions. Although the findings are not unexpected they confirm journalistic and anecdotal findings from previous experiences and case reports.
Page 4 Line 55, please change 'anonyms' to 'anonymous'.
Recommendation: Accept for publication with minor revisions.
Thank you,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 1 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me. My recommendation to the author is considering below reference: Pergolizzi Jr. JV, Magnusson P, LeQuang JA, Breve F, Paladini A, et al. The Current Clinically Relevant Findings on COVID-19 Pandemic, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(2):e103819.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 1 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,

Based on reviewers' comments this manuscript needs major revision.

Regards

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

1 Aug 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.

Reviewer comment	Action and corrections	Page and line
Reviewer 1: Page 4 Line 55; please change 'anonyms' to 'anonymous'.	Corrected	Page 2 Line 51
Reviewer 2: This article deals with mental stress among anesthesiologists and anesthesiologist-intensivists at the onset of Covid-19 pandemic based on a survey. Hence, the questionnaire could have been different in the middle of a pandemic	Added (the article dealt with mental stress at the beginning of Covid-19 pandemic. Hence, there must be a further study and questionnaire in the middle and the end of the pandemic.)	Page 9 lines:157-159
(Ref: Fleisher LA et al: NEJM Catalyst Vol. No. | July 8, 2020 DOI: 10.1056/CAT.20.0270).	Added	Page 7 line 134
Philosophical sentences (lines 34-36) should be avoided in scientific articles.	Changed	Page2 line 34-36
Questionnaire figures: may be avoided; only questions could be put inside one box/table	Changed to table	Table 1
Table 2: Inadequate training on donning and doffing is statistically significant (p=0.017); needs be discussed	P value was 0.816 which is not significant	Table 3

Figure 8 is repetition of the text	For more demonstration	No changes
Preventive and possible treatment measures for severe mental stress need to be discussed.	Added	Page 8 lines:139-14
Reviewer 3: The current manuscript can be strengthened by repeating the survey amongst the same group of caregivers after a time frame, reflecting the benefits of awareness of the current pandemic in allying the stress associated with the pandemic.	Added (the article dealt with mental stress at the beginning of Covid-19 pandemic. Hence, there must be a further study and questionnaire in the middle and the end of the pandemic.)	Page 9 lines:157-159
Reviewer 4: Pergolizzi Jr. JV, Magnusson P, LeQuang JA, Breve F, Paladini A, et al. The Current Clinically Relevant Findings on COVID-19 Pandemic, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(2):e103819.	Added	references

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) — 14 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
Revised manuscript ID#106623 was reviewed, and it is acceptable for publishing
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 14 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
Fortunately, the author could change the requested items, and now it can be considered for publishing at Anesth Pain Med.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 14 Aug 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.