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.119354
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(1) ; e119354

Peer Review Report for "Evaluating the Relationship Between Depression and Pain Anxiety with Pain Catastrophizing in Patients with COVID-19"

Author(s): Mahshid Ghasemi, Faranak Behnaz, Nima Hassanzad, Farinaz Taheri

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Sep 2021
Revised Date:	5 Feb 2022
Accepted Date:	8 Feb 2022

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

20 Sep 2021

Dear chief editor of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine,
Thanks for your invitation. I found this article interesting; but there are some points:
1- There are some grammatical mistakes
2- Since March 2017 to April 2016???
3- Abstract is not structured (introduction, method, results, and conclusion)
4- As an original and research article, it needs to be consulted by a skilled and professional author.
5- References should be valid and cited in PubMed or Scopus. It need some corrections based on Vancouver style. Also, suggest more related references.

6- Finally, this is a retrospective study, and it is up to the editorial board to accept or reject it.
7- My comment, after corrections, it can be consider as Brief report.

REFEREE : Reviewer

23 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
Thank you for your kind invitation
The article needs to be revised on some parts:
1- Please rewrite the discussion part with more explanation and comparing studies.
2- Please write the abstract with more details.
3- It need some more references.

REFEREE : Associate Editor

24 Sep 2021

Dear editor in chief.
I read the manuscript Relationships of depression and pain anxiety with pain catastrophizing in patients with Covid-19.
The following issues needed to be corrected.
The abstract should be written as standard method.
There are many grammatical and typographical errors that need to be corrected
In expressing the problem of patients, the principle of work in Covid19 patients is not mentioned.
And in fact there is an Inconsistency between patients' problem and study design.
Unfortunately, the correct writing structure of the discussion in the article is not observed and needs a fundamental review.
The study discussion should be rewritten and complete so that it can express the above problem in Covid 19 patients.
It is worth noting that the use of references related to this study and other comments can help to discuss the study effectively.

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 Reviewer 1:

Thanks for your notification. Attempts were made to make corrections based on the recommendations.

1- Since March 2017 to April 2016???

This corrected from March 2019 to April 2020

2- Abstract is not structured (introduction, method, results, and conclusion)

In abstract corrected(introduction, method, results, and conclusion)

3- References should be valid and cited in PubMed or Scopus. It need some corrections based on Vancouver style. Also, suggest more related references.

References valid added to manuscript

Reviewer 2:

1- Please rewrite the discussion part with more explanation and comparing studies.

The manuscript was reviewed and revised

2- Please write the abstract with more details.

The details of the abstract were corrected

3- It need some more references.

Suggested references were added to the manuscript

With best regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : EIC

21 Jan 2022

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

1.Reviewer 1:
I read this revised manuscript, and author tried to correct some of the requested items. Suggest to update the references, and keep the references section limit to 30.

1.I revised manuscript, and then tried to correct some of the requested items. I tried to update the references, and keep the references section limit to 30. (References 11,26.30 update)

2.Associate Editor 1:
Dear Editorials
Based on reviewers' comments, this revised format need some corrections for updating all suggested references before publishing.
Final decision: Minor revision

2.I revised manuscript, and then tried to correct some of the requested items.

3.EIC Decision

Please do not write the Acknowledgments part in the Full Manuscript File. Please, include it in the cover letter file.

- Tables

1. Table (2) is not mentioned in the text correctly. Please mention the Table (s) in the text consecutively

3.Acknowledgment's part was removed and moved to the cover letter. Table 2 mentioned in text correctly.

with best regards
Dr F Behnaz
Correspond Author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : EIC

8 Feb 2022

Accept