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.113020
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(2); e113020

Peer Review Report for "Dorsal Root Ganglion (DRG) and Chronic Pain"

Author(s): Amnon A. Berger, Yao Liu, HarLee Possoit, Anna C. Rogers, Warner Moore, Kyle Gress, Elyse M. Cornett, Alan David Kaye, Farnad Imani, Kambiz Sadegi, Giustino Varrassi, Omar Viswanath, Ivan Urits

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 18 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 1 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 4 Mar 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Kamran Mahmoudi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 31 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The keywords need to be revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 11 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I read with interest this article. The topic is suitable. Recommend for considering below nine references:
- Berger AA, Urits I, Hasoon J, Gill J, Aner M, Yazdi CA, et al. Improved Pain Control with Combination Spinal Cord Stimulator Therapy utilizing Sub-Perception and Traditional Paresthesia Based Waveforms: A Pilot Study. Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(1):e113089.
- Tully J, Jung JW, Patel A, Tukan A, Kandula S, Doan A, et al. Utilization of Intravenous Lidocaine Infusion for the Treatment of Refractory Chronic Pain. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e112290.
- Urits I, Jung JW, Amgalan A, Fortier L, Anya A, Wesp B, et al. Utilization of Magnesium for the Treatment of Chronic Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(1):e112348.

- Urits I, Schwartz R, Smoots D, Koop L, Veeravelli S, et al. Peripheral Neuromodulation for the Management of Headache. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e110515.
- Abejón D, Vancamp T, Monzón EM. A Cost-Consequence Analysis Examining the Differences Between NonRechargeable and Rechargeable Systems. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(1):e100308
- Patel VB, Wasserman R, Imani F. Interventional Therapies for Chronic Low Back Pain: A Focused Review (Efficacy and Outcomes). Anesth Pain Med. 2015;5(4): e29716.
- Imani F. Using Pulsed Radiofrequency for Chronic Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2012;1(3):155-156.
- Malik KM, Imani F, Beckerly R, Chovatiya R. Risk of Opioid Use Disorder from Exposure to Opioids in the Perioperative Period: A Systematic Review. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(1):e101339.
- Colini-Baldeschi G, Amorizzo E. Peripheral Nerve Stimulation: two cases of intractable neuropathic pain. Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(2):e113162
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 16 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewers' comments this article need some correction.
Final decision: Minor revision
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 16 Feb 2021

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.

Dorsal Root Ganglion (DRG) and Chronic Pain

Reply to reviewers

Dear Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript " Dorsal Root Ganglion (DRG) and Chronic Pain". Please see below our detailed reply to the reviewers.

1. *Reviewer 1: The keywords need to be revised.*

   Reply: The keywords have been revised. If any specific revision is required, please give us more details and we will do so, or the editor may want to add/edit any keywords as you see fit.
2. *Reviewer 2: Recommend for considering below nine references.*

   Reply: We have added the first 8 recommended references. As the 9th is not yet published and unavailable for us, we are unable to add it to this work, but are waiting to read it once it is available so that it can be included in a future work.

Sincerely,

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 4 Mar 2021

Dear EIC
The author could correct the requested items, and now it is ready for publishing.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Mar 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.