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.113408
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(3); e113408

Peer Review Report for "A Comparative Study of Valsalva Maneuver, Lidocaine, and Valsalva Maneuvers with Administration of Lidocaine to Reduce the Pain Associated with Administration of Etomidate During General Anesthesia"

Author(s): Behzad Nazemroaya, Omid Aghadavodi, Azim Honarmand, Sarina Ahmadian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 1 May 2021
Accepted Date: 18 May 2021

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 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
- In the material and methods, the procedure isn't explained in sufficient detail. How and who did it? When was the valsalva maneuver done and how was it done simultaneously with the lidocaine?
- What does and when were the drugs used, especially narcotics, at what time, from etomidate, exactly was lidocaine and valsalva maneuver administered?
- English grammar needs to be edited briefly. The discussion needs a comparison of the texts and other articles mentioned.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 20 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Correction items include the following:
1. In title: Word of “general” adds to anesthesia.

2. In key words: add general anesthesia
3. Materials and methods: Please explain about, premedication, Valsalva maneuver, Time to do Valsalva maneuver, blindness, Randomize, monitoring, Exclude of patients using corticosteroids and seizures, location of catheter and arrangement of drug injection, VAS
4. Discussion; Compare with other studies, Write an interpretation of the results of this study.
5. References: Corrected references 13 and 14 and add recent references.
6. English edit to be done.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 20 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
According to the study of the manuscript and the opinion of the reviews, this manuscript does not have enough novelty for publishing but may be considered as a brief report.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 11 Mar 2021

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.

Dear Editor in Chief

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

- In the material and methods , procedure isn't explained in sufficient details. How and who did it? When was the valsalva maneuver done and how was it done simultaneously with the lidocaine ? What dose and when were the drugs used, especially narcotics, at what time ,from etomidate, exactly was lidocaine and valsalva maneuver administered? English grammar needs to be edited briefly. The discussion needs comparison of the texts and other articles mentioned.

Author Answer: Corrections were made on **page 2, paragraph9 & page3 paragraph1,2,3**

Reviewer 2:

Correction items include the following:

1. In title: Word of "general" adds to anesthesia. **Author Answer: added**
2. In key words: add general anesthesia **Author Answer: added**
3. Materials and methods: Please explain about, premedication, Valsalva maneuver, Time to do Valsalva maneuver, blindness, Randomize, monitoring, exclude of patients using corticosteroids and seizures, location of catheter and arrangement of drug injection, VAS 4. Discussion; Compare with other studies, Write an interpretation on the results of this study.
5. References: Corrected of references 13 and 14 and add recent references. **Author Answer: In the methodology, Valsalva maneuver and time was described. using corticosteroids and seizures added. In the Discussion write, compare with other studies and interpretation on the results of this study added.**
6. English edit to be done. **Author Answer: Editing done**

Best Regards,

03/28/2021

Start Chat

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) 22 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
I read with interest this revised format. Here are my points:
1) Table 1 should be revised, mention units, correct data (40.2114.96±??!!), and gender at one row
2) Ref 12 and 15 are similar
3) Consider and add below four references:
- Nazemroaya B, Mousavi SM. Comparison of Premedication with Low-Dose Midazolam Versus Etomidate for Reduction of Etomidate-Induced Myoclonus During General Anesthesia for Electroconvulsive Therapy: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(6):e94388.
- Adinehmehr L, Shetabi H, Moradi Farsani D, Salehi A, Noorbakhsh M. Comparison of the Sedation Quality of Etomidate, Propofol, and Midazolam in Combination with Fentanyl During Phacoemulsification Cataract Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Controlled, Clinical Trial. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(2):e87415.
- Ghasemi M, Mosaffa F, Hoseini B, Behnaz F. Comparison of the Effect of Bicarbonate, Hyaluronidase, and Lidocaine Injection on Myofascial Pain Syndrome, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(3):e101037.
- Tully J, Jung JW, Patel A, Tukan A, Kandula S, et al. Utilization of Intravenous Lidocaine Infusion for the Treatment of Refractory Chronic Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e112290.
4) Change article style to Brief Report
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Following reviewers' comments, this article needs some corrections before publishing.
Final decision: Minor revision.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 22 Apr 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 (2)

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.

Dear Editor in Chief

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Editor in Chief I read with interest this revised format. Here are my points:

1) Table 1 should be revised, mention units, correct data (40.2114.96±??!!), and gender at one row 2) Ref 12 and 15 are similar Was corrected

3) Consider and add below four references: Nazemroaya B, Mousavi SM. Comparison of Premedication with Low-Dose Midazolam Versus Etomidate for Reduction of Etomidate-Induced Myoclonus During General Anesthesia for Electroconvulsive Therapy: A Randomized Clinical Trial. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(6):e94388. Adinehmehr L, Shetabi H, Moradi Farsani D, Salehi A, Noorbakhsh M. Comparison of the Sedation Quality of Etomidate, Propofol, and Midazolam in Combination with Fentanyl During Phacoemulsification Cataract Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Controlled, Clinical Trial. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(2):e87415.

Ghasemi M, Mosaffa F, Hoseini B, Behnaz F. Comparison of the Effect of Bicarbonate, Hyaluronidase, and Lidocaine Injection on Myofascial Pain Syndrome, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(3):e101037. Tully J, Jung JW, Patel A, Tukan A, Kandula S, et al. Utilization of Intravenous Lidocaine Infusion for the Treatment of Refractory Chronic Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e112290. All 4 references were added.(**references :3,4,9,10**)

4) Change article style to Brief Report. Research Article became Brief Report, Abstract became shorter1 and Tables + 1figures are 2

Best Regards,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 18 May 2021

Dear AE,
This revised manuscript was reviewed, and necessary corrections were made.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 18 May 2021

Dear EIC,
Fortunately, the author could correct all requested items, and based on reviewers' comments, this revised format is acceptable for publishing.
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 18 May 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.