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 "**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:

Peer Review

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/aapm.118317
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(1) ; e118317

Peer Review Report for "Neurofascial Dextrose Prolotherapy for Managing Chronic Ankle Ligament Injury"

Author(s): Morteza Kazempour Mofrad, Zahra Rezasoltani, Afsaneh Dadarkhah, Sanaz Hamidi Panah, Seyed Morteza Tabatabaee, Arezoo Azarakhsh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	3 Sep 2021
Revised Date:	19 Dec 2021
Accepted Date:	19 Dec 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 Mahmoodi : Reviewer

10 Sep 2021

My opinions are as follows:
1- It's better that you don't mention the place of study in the abstract.
2- Keywords need to be revised according to the title of the manuscript.
3- In the abstract and stem of the manuscript (results and discussion) CAIT score before intervention need to be revised and corrected. (1.88±2.35).
4- In method part, the approval date should be revised and corrected.
5. Hospital name was repetitive for some times and should be deleted
6. At Method: Only method should be more describe, and other part at this section should be summarize.

7. Results: delete demographic data at text
The tables are very vague and confusing for the reader and need structural reform
8. Recommend to add some more and new references.

Amir-Aziz Saif : Reviewer

14 Sep 2021

Here are my suggestions:
1. What is the exact criteria's of Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool (CAIT) and Persian version of CAIT questionnaire validated by Haji-Maghsoudi et al. among Iranians and how we can measure them? (with details)
2. Why the authors have used 12.5% glucose and not the other concentrations? Has it any scientific reason?
3. The 12.5 concentration of glucose is not usually available commercial (usually 5% and 50 % are routine). It is logical to explain how have the authors provided it?
4. Why is the period between injections is one month? And why two injections?
5. Line 82 and 83 can be deleted (This is a Primary Registry ...)
6. All part should be summarize.

Poupak Rahimzadeh : Associate Editor

28 Sep 2021

Dear EIC
Thanks for inviting me.
Enclosed please find the comments.
It needs Major revision.

REFEREE : EIC

3 Oct 2021

Major Revision

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 Reviewers,

Thanks for reviewing our article and valuable suggestions to improve our manuscript. Here are answers to reviewers opinion and subsequent changes have done on main manuscript.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
1- It's better that you don't mention the place of study in the abstract. Deleted
2- Keywords need to be revised according to the title of the manuscript. Revised
3- In the abstract and stem of the manuscript (results and discussion) CAIT score before intervention need to be revised and corrected. (1.88±2.35). re-analysis showed the same results and according to data it seems to be correct.
4- In method part, the approval date should be revised and corrected. Corrected.
5. Hospital name was repetitive for some times and should be deleted. Deleted
6. At Method: Only method should be more describe, and other part at this section should be summarize. Done
7. Results: delete demographic data at text. All irrelevant demographic data deleted.
The tables are very vague and confusing for the reader and need structural reform
8. Recommend to add some more and new references. Done

Reviewer 2:
Here are my suggestions:
1. What is the exact criteria's of Cumberland Ankle Instability Tool (CAIT) and Persian version of CAIT questionnaire validated by Haji-Maghsoudi et al. among Iranians and how we can measure them? (with details). Added in method section.
2. Why the authors have used 12.5% glucose and not the other concentrations? Has it any scientific reason? Previous and related articles used same dose.
3. The 12.5 concentration of glucose is not usually available commercial (usually 5% and 50 % are routine). It is logical to explain how have the authors provided it? Explained.
4. Why is the period between injections is one month? And why two injections? We used this method in similar study on rotator cuff tendinopathy.
5. Line 82 and 83 can be deleted (This is a Primary Registry ...) Deleted.
6. All part should be summarize. Done.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 13 Dec 2021

Dear Editor in Chief
Thank you for inviting me to review the revised manuscript entitled "Neurofascial dextrose prolotherapy in the management of chronic injury of ankle ligaments".
Author could try to correct some of requested items. Please up-date references section.
Sincerely your

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 13 Dec 2021

Dear Editorials
Following reviewers' comments this article need some corrections before the next process..
Final decision: Minor revision
Regards
AE

REFEREE : EIC — 13 Dec 2021

Minor Revision

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 Reviewers,

Thanks for reviewing our article and valuable suggestions to improve our manuscript.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Editor in Chief

Thank you for inviting me to review the revised manuscript entitled "Neurofascial dextrose prolotherapy in the management of chronic injury of ankle ligaments". Author could try to correct some of requested items. Please up-date references section.

Mentioned modifications was done and new references were added and highlighted in reference section.

Kind regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 19 Dec 2021

Dear Editor in Chief
This revised manuscript was reviewed, and necessary corrections were made
Sincerely

REFEREE : Associate Editor — 19 Dec 2021

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

Farnad Imani : EIC — 19 Dec 2021

Dear Authors,
We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication. The reviewers found your work to be valuable, scientifically sound, and a meaningful contribution to the field. We appreciate the effort and dedication you invested in this study, and we thank you for choosing our journal to share your research. Congratulations on this achievement, and we look forward to your future submissions.