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.116836
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(4); e116836

Peer Review Report for "Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Anesthesia and Critical Care Residents in Spain"

Author(s): Isabel Aisa, Juan Llau, Jose Maria Gonzalez, Carlos Delgado, Maria Otero, Carolina-Soledad Romero, Juan Catala, Jose De Andres

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Jun 2021
Revised Date: 6 Jul 2021
Accepted Date: 7 Jul 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)

11 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
I read with interest the article titled "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Anesthesia and Critical Care residents training and education". Overall, it is well written. My suggestion is to consider the following references:

- 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.
- Ali H, Ismail AA, Abdalwahab A . Mental Stress in Anesthesia and Intensive Care Physicians During COVID-19 Outbreak. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(5):e106623.
- Dabbagh A, Ahmadizadeh SN, Asgari S, Fani K, Massoudi N, et al. Attitudes of the Third-Year Clinical Anesthesiology Residents Toward an Independent Clinical Practice Rotation in COVID-19 Pandemic in Iran. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e110755.
- Mukhdomi F, Woolley P, Mukhdomi J, Beck B, Patel D, Harris M, et al. An Evaluation of the Online Quality of Content of United States Accredited Pain Medicine Fellowship Training Programs. Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(3):e115981.
- Villar J, Añón JM, Ferrando C, Aguilar G, Muñoz T, Ferreres J, et al. COVID-19 psychological impact in 3109 healthcare workers in Spain: The PSIMCOV group. Trials.

2020 Aug 16;21(1):717.

Sincerely

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 11 Jun 2021

Dear AE,

Thanks for submitting this valuable study. I have a few questions and recommendations about it.

1. There are some typographical and grammatical errors in the text that need to be corrected.
2. What is PIOF stand for? “Objective Formative Impact Score (OFIS)” or “Objective Impact Score on the Formative Routine (OISFR)”. Which one is correct? Both of them have been mentioned. What does “P” in PIOF stand for?
3. In Material and Methods, it was mentioned that a 35-question digital questionnaire has been used in this study, but in Appendix A, there is only 28 questions. Please explain more about it.
4. Unfortunately, Appendix B was not available in the version sent to me. There is no explanation in the text for scoring this questionnaire and no information is given about the significant score provided in this questionnaire. Perhaps it would be better to be explained more in the text.
5. It is recommended that more details about Figure 2 and its scores be given in the Results section.
6. Graphs’ titles should be written below each one.

Good luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 13 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,

I read with interest this article and based on reviewers' comments it needs some corrections before publishing.

Final decision: Minor revision

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 13 Jun 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.

Answers to Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Author(s)

Thank you for submitting this valuable study. I have a few questions and recommendations about it.

1. There are some typographical and grammatical errors in the text that need to be corrected.

The text has been revised in its entirety, errors have been detected that have been corrected, and with this we hope to have corrected the deficiencies found in the article.

2. What is PIOF stand for? “Objective Formative Impact Score (OFIS)” or “Objective Impact Score on the Formative Routine (OISFR)”. Which one are correct? Both of them has been mentioned. What does “P” in PIOF stand for?

Thank you very much for pointing out this important mistake. There is only one primary variable and now throughout the text it has been correctly defined: Objective Formative Impact Score (OFIS)

3. In Material and Methods, it was mentioned that a 35-question digital questionnaire has been used in this study, but in Appendix A, there are only 28 question. Please explain more about it.

Thank you very much for pointing out this misspelling. The questionnaire had 28 items, and not 35. The error has come because initially 35 items were worked on but finally some were grouped as subitems and with that, the final number was 28.

4. Unfortunately, Appendix B was not available in the version sent to me. There is no explanation in the text for scoring this questionnaire and no information is given about the significant score provided in this questionnaire. Perhaps it would be better to be explained more in the text.

The reviewer's comment is very accurate and timely. Appendix B has been annulled and the information has been included in the text providing the meaning of the p 'score provided by this account. Thanks for your suggestion

5. It is recommended that more details about Figure 2 and its scores be given in the Results section.

Thank you very much for pointing out this fact. In the reviewed text some information of figure 2 and its scores, has been included.

6. Graphs’ titles should be written below each one.

Now ammended

Reviewer 2:

Dear Editorial

I read with interest the article as titled "Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on Anesthesia and Critical Care residents training and education". Overall, it is well written. My suggestion is to consider following references:

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.

Ali H, Ismail AA, Abdalwahab A . Mental Stress in Anesthesia and Intensive Care

Physicians During COVID-19 Outbreak. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(5):e106623.
Dabbagh A, Ahmadizadeh SN, Asgari S, Fani K, Massoudi N, et al. Attitudes of the Third-Year Clinical Anesthesiology Residents Toward an Independent Clinical Practice Rotation in COVID-19 Pandemic in Iran. Anesth Pain Med. 2020;10(6):e110755.
Mukhdomi F, Woolley P, Mukhdomi J, Beck B, Patel D, Harris M, et al. An Evaluation of the Online Quality of Content of United States Accredited Pain Medicine Fellowship Training Programs. Anesth Pain Med. 2021;11(3):e115981.
Villar J, Añón JM, Ferrando C, Aguilar G, Muñoz T, Ferreres J, et al. COVID-19 psychological impact in 3109 healthcare workers in Spain: The PSIMCOV group. Trials. 2020 Aug 16;21(1):717.
Thank You for your suggestions, now included in the reviewed manuscript

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) 7 Jul 2021

Dear EIC,
I read with interest this revised format, and fortunately, author could correct all requested items, and now it is acceptable for publishing.
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 7 Jul 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.