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.115576
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(4); e115576

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of Intraoperative Infusion of Remifentanil Versus Fentanyl on Pain Management in Patients Undergoing Spine Surgery: A Double Blinded Randomized Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Reza Shariat Moharari, Shervin Shahinpour, Negin Saeedi, Elaheh Sahraei, Atabak Najafi, Farhad Etezadi, Mohamadreza Khajavi, Ayat Ahmadi, Pejman Pourfakhr

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	13 Jun 2021
Revised Date:	26 Jul 2021
Accepted Date:	6 Aug 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) 17 Jun 2021

Dear AE
It was my pleasure to review this manuscript.
I read the article but it has no novelty! My points for improving the quality of the article are as follows:
- Please explain why the method of this Clinical Trial at IRCT was different in this article?
- Type of spinal surgery?
- Range of age is too wide! (18-60 yrs)
- Ref#1 was not mentioned at main text!
- Drug study character? (Brande name, Co. Country)
Suggest to the author for adding below 6 refs:
- Janatmakan F, Nassajian N , Jarirahmadi S, Tabatabaee K , Zafari M. Comparison of the Effect of Dexmedetomidine and Remifentanil on Pain Control After Spinal Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(2)
- Imani F, Alebouyeh M, Taghipour Anvari Z, Faiz S H R. Use of Remifentanil and Alfentanil

in Endotracheal Intubation: A Comparative Study, Anesth Pain Med. 2011 ; 1(2):61-65.
- Rupniewska-Ladyko A, Malec-Milewska M. A High Dose of Fentanyl May Accelerate the Onset of Acute Postoperative Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2019; 9(5):e94498.
- Janatmakan F, Nesioonpour S, Javaherforoosh Zadeh F, Teimouri A, Vaziri M. Comparing the Effect of Clonidine and Dexmedetomidine on Intraoperative Bleeding in Spine Surgery, Anesth Pain Med. 2019 ; 9(1):e83967.
- Javaherforooshzadeh F, Amirpour I, Janatmakan F, Soltanzadeh M. Comparison of Effects of Melatonin and Gabapentin on Post Operative Anxiety and Pain in Lumbar Spine Surgery: A Randomized Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2018; 8(3):e68763.
- Imani F, Varrassi G. Ketamine as Adjuvant for Acute Pain Management, Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(6):e100178.
Sincerely yours

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 20 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- There are lots of grammatical errors. I couldn't find any novelty in this manuscript.
- Table 2-4 should be re-design. Mention data as Mean±SD with each other in one cell for all boxes (not different in two-column. Also, to simplify these tables, mention two groups (Remifentanil and Fentanyl) only for one time in two different horizontal columns.
- Table 5, RSS measurement times?
- Delete both figures.
- Merge the tables 2 & 3 together, and also 4 & 5 together.
- References should be written as Vancouver style
Recommend below six references:
- 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.
- Malik K M, 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
- Imani F, Zaman B, De Negri P. Postoperative Pain Management: Role of Dexmedetomidine as Adjuvant. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e112176.
- Javaherforooshzadeh F, Monajemzadeh S A, Soltanzadeh M, Janatmakan F, Salari A, et al. A Comparative Study of the Amount of Bleeding and Hemodynamic Changes between Dexmedetomidine Infusion and Remifentanil Infusion for Controlled Hypotensive Anesthesia in Lumbar Discopathy Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2018 ; 8(2):e66959
- Rahimzadeh P, Faiz SHR, Imani F, Soltani A, Derakhshan P. The Effect of Nitroglycerine Infusion on Postoperative Pain in Lower Limb Surgery: A Clinical Double-Blind Study. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(4):e93848.
- TaghipourAnvari Z, Afshar-Fereydouniyan N, Imani F, Sakhaei M, Alijani B, Mohseni M. Effect of Clonidine Premedication on Blood Loss in Spine Surgery. Anesth Pain Med. 2012;1(4):252-6.
Good luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
Thank you for giving opportunity of review of this manuscript to me.
According reviewers' comments the novelty is under question. Language grammatical errors are too much. Also, need more references.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Jun 2021

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

Reviewer 1:

Dear AE

It was my pleasure to review this manuscript.

I read the article but it has not novelty!

We organized this study to evaluate better perioperative pain management strategy in older patients with spine canal stenosis and younger patients undergone scoliosis surgery that are challengeable in postoperative pain control.

My points for improving the quality of the article are as follows:

1.Please explain why the method of this Clinical Trial at IRCT was some differences by this article?

Dear editorial board of Anesthesiology and pain medicine

In method section of this Clinical Trial at IRCT we had three interventional groups based on analgesics prescribed for patients but because all of the patients received intravenous acetaminophen at the end of the surgery (for better allocation and randomization) finally we had two different groups that are reported in the article.

2. Type of spinal surgery?

Method section 5th line. (Highlighted in gray)

Range of age is too wide! (18-60 yrs)

Some younger patients had scoliosis but the others had lumbar canal stenosis.

3. Ref#1 was not mentioned at main text!

Reference one is mentioned in 2nd line of introduction part. (Highlighted in gray)

4. Drug study character? (Brande name, Co. Country)

They are now mentioned in method section and they are highlighted in gray.

Suggest to author for adding below 6 refs:

Janatmakan F, Nassajian N , Jarirahmadi S, Tabatabaee K , Zafari M. Comparison of the Effect of Dexmedetomidine and Remifentanil on Pain Control After Spinal Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(2)

Imani F, Alebouyeh M, Taghipour Anvari Z, Faiz S H R. Use of Remifentanil and Alfentanil in Endotracheal Intubation: A Comparative Study, Anesth Pain Med. 2011 ; 1(2):61-65.

Rupniewska-Ladyko A, Malec-Milewska M. A High Dose of Fentanyl May Accelerate the Onset of Acute Postoperative Pain, Anesth Pain Med. 2019; 9(5):e94498. (added)

Janatmakan F, Nesioonpour S, Javaherforoosh Zadeh F, Teimouri A, Vaziri M. Comparing the Effect of Clonidine and Dexmedetomidine on Intraoperative Bleeding in Spine Surgery, Anesth Pain Med. 2019 ; 9(1):e83967.

Javaherforooshzadeh F, Amirpour I, Janatmakan F, Soltanzadeh M. Comparison of Effects of Melatonin and Gabapentin on Postoperative Anxiety and Pain in Lumbar Spine Surgery: A Randomized Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2018; 8(3):e68763.

Imani F, Varrassi G. Ketamine as Adjuvant for Acute Pain Management, Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(6):e100178.(added)

Sincerely yours

Reviewer 2:
Dear EIC/ Anesth Pain Med
1.There is lots of grammatical errors.

They have been corrected ad they are highlighted in yellow.

2. I couldn't find any novelty in this manuscript.

We organized this study to evaluate better perioperative pain management strategy in older patients with spine canal stenosis and younger patients undergone scoliosis surgery that are challengeable in postoperative pain control.
3. Table 2-4 should be re-design. Mention data as Mean±SD with each other in one cell for all boxes (not different in two column. Also, to simplify these tables, mention two groups (Remifentanil and Fentanyl) only for one time in two different horizontal columns.

Table 2-4 should be re-design have been redesigned simplified.
4.Table 5, RSS measurement times?

Rss RSS measurement times have been written in the table 5.
5. Delete both figures.

Done
6. Merge the tables 2 & 3 together, and also 4 & 5 together.

We couldn’t merge the tables but we redesigned them and they are simplified.

References should be written as Vancouver style

Done
Recommend below six references:
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.
Malik K M, 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 (added)
Imani F, Zaman B, De Negri P. Postoperative Pain Management: Role of Dexmedetomidine as Adjuvant. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e112176.
Javaherforooshzadeh F, Monajemzadeh S A, Soltanzadeh M, Janatmakan F, Salari A, et al. A Comparative Study of the Amount of Bleeding and Hemodynamic Changes between Dexmedetomidine Infusion and Remifentanil Infusion for Controlled Hypotensive Anesthesia in Lumbar Discopathy Surgery: A Double-Blind, Randomized, Clinical Trial, Anesth Pain Med. 2018 ; 8(2):e66959
Rahimzadeh P, Faiz SHR, Imani F, Soltani A, Derakhshan P. The Effect of Nitroglycerine Infusion on Postoperative Pain in Lower Limb Surgery: A Clinical Double-Blind Study. Anesth Pain Med. 2019;9(4):e93848.
TaghipourAnvari Z, Afshar-Fereydouniyan N, Imani F, Sakhaei M, Alijani B, Mohseni M. Effect of Clonidine

Premedication on Blood Loss in Spine Surgery. Anesth Pain Med. 2012;1(4):252-6.
Good luck

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC,
Thank you for giving opportunity of review of this manuscript to me.
According reviewers' comments the novelty is under question. Language grammatical errors are too much. Also, need more references.
Regards
AE

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) 18 Jul 2021

Dear EIC,
Fortunately, the author could reply to somewhat about reviewers' and AEs' comments, but they suggest considering all bellow recommendations:
1) Design tables 4 and 5 at ONE table
2) To simplify tables 2, 3, and 4, both groups should be at two columns (similar to tables 1 and 5), and avoid repeating group names in multiple rows
3) If there is a significant difference, it should be mentioned in each table in footnotes.
4) Follow the AEs' comments including consider and add ALL references suggested by both reviewers.
Final decision: Minor revision
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Jul 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 Associate Editor:

We Designed tables 4 and 5 at ONE table due to previous Associate Editor 1 comment and we have drawn all four tables.

Tables

1. Table 5 is not drawn in the word file, please draw it.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear Editor in Chief
Fortunately the author could reply to some what about reviewers' and AEs' comments, but they suggest to consider all bellow recommendations:
1) Design tables 4 and 5 at ONE table

Done

2) To simplify tables 2, 3, and 4, both groups should be at two columns (similar to tables 1 and 5), and avoid repeating group names in multiple rows

Done

3) If there is a significant difference, it should be mentioned in each table in footnotes.

Done

4) Follow the AEs' comments including consider and add ALL references suggested by the both reviewers.

Done

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) 6 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me again for this revised format. Author add suggested references and this revision can be accepted for publishing.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 6 Aug 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewers' comments this article received an acceptance score. Please pay attention for write units for Table 3 at the final publisher process
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Aug 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.