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://brief.land/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.119674
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(5); e119674

Peer Review Report for "Aminophylline for Prevention and/or Treatment of Post-Dural Puncture Headache: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Study Protocol"

Author(s): Ali Reza Safarpour, Manoosh Mehrabi, Firoozeh Tarkesh, Hadis Ashrafizadeh, Abbasali Keshtkar, Hassan Askari, Danya Abazari, Afshin Amini, Reza Barati-Boldaji

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	17 Sep 2021
Revised Date:	18 Oct 2021
Accepted Date:	26 Oct 2021

Revision (0)

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

Farhad Etezadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
I read article no: 119674,
It is a well-written article deserving publication.
The introduction and methods are perfect.
There are rare grammatical errors.
I Suggest to consider some new references.
Thanks.

Farsad Imani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2021

Dear AE,

#The review question was clearly defined in terms of population, interventions, comparators, outcomes and study designs (PICOS)
The search strategy was adequate and appropriate. There were no restrictions on language. #publication status: unpublished papers and theses were assessed by asking experts. In addition, papers will be included if they are acceptable in terms of relevant data and quality analysis.
#Publication date: All available relevant studies published between 01/01/1980 and 30/06/2020 would be considered in this study.
#Preventative steps were taken to minimize bias and errors in the study selection process by using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias.
Appropriate criteria were used to assess the quality of the primary studies, and preventative steps were taken to minimize bias and errors in the quality assessment process
Appropriate methods were used for data synthesis
BUT
Authors' do not have any conclusions that reflect the evidence that was reviewed.
Thanks.

Farsad Imani: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2021

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewers' comments this article needs some corrections. Also it needs some more references
Regards
AE

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Oct 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 and Reviewers

We highly appreciate for your detailed and valuable comments on our manuscript (No.: 119674, Entitled; Aminophylline for prevention and/or Treatment of Post-dural Puncture Headache: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis, Study Protocol). We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. The suggestions were quite helpful for us and we incorporated them in the revised paper. We had referred to literatures and reconstructed the manuscript which is provided in below. The changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow.

Response to the Reviewer #1:

Comment 1.

It is a well-written article deserving publication.

The introduction and methods are perfect.

There are rare grammatical errors.

Suggest to consider some new references

Response:

Thanks for your comments. The grammatical and writing errors were revised and improved by two experts. All grammatical changes have been highlighted in yellow.

Thanks for your valuable suggestion. Some new references were added to the manuscript. To read as follow:

- de Almeida SM, Shumaker SD, LeBlanc SK, Delaney P, Marquie-Beck J, Ueland S, et al. Incidence of post-dural puncture headache in research volunteers. Headache. 2011;51(10):1503-10.
- Jane LA, Wray AA. Lumbar Puncture. StatPearls [Internet]. 2020.
- Meshram S, Deshmukh P, Sabale P, Bankar N, Chandak VC. Incidence of Post Dural Puncture Headache in Our Set Up with Quincke Spinal Needle: An Observational Crossectional Study. Indian Journal of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology. 2020;14(4).

- O'Shaughnessy S, Fitzgerald C, Katiri R, Kieran S, Loughrey J. Permanent hearing loss and tinnitus following epidural analgesia complicated by accidental dural puncture. International Journal of Obstetric Anesthesia. 2020;43:9-12.

- Patel R, Urits I, Orhurhu V, Orhurhu MS, Peck J, Ohuabunwa E, et al. A Comprehensive Update on the Treatment and Management of Postdural Puncture Headache. Current Pain and Headache Reports. 2020;24(6):24.
- Shivan M, Smita P, Parul M, Keshaban M. Effect of reinsertion of the spinal needle stylet after spinal anaesthesia procedure on post dural puncture headache in women undergoing caesarean delivery. Indian Journal of Anaesthesia. 2020;64(11):971.

- Abate SM, Ahmed S, Anbese GM, Basu B. Efficacy and safety of prophylactic intrathecal normal saline for prevention of Post Dural Puncture Headache among women undergoing cesarean section under spinal anesthesia: A randomized controlled trial. International Journal of Surgery Open. 2021;35:100396.

- Cognat E, Koehl B, Lilamand M, Goutagny S, Belbachir A, de Charentenay L, et al. Preventing Post-Lumbar Puncture Headache. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2021;78(3):443-50.

- Sievänen H, Kari J, Halonen S, Elomaa T, Tammela O, Soukka H, et al. Real-time detection of cerebrospinal fluid with bioimpedance needle in paediatric lumbar puncture. Clinical Physiology and Functional Imaging. 2021;41(4):303-9.

- April MD, Long B. Does Bed Rest or Fluid Supplementation Prevent Post–Dural Puncture Headache? Annals of emergency medicine. 2018;71(5):e55-e7.

Response to the reviewer #2

Comment 1:

#The review question was clearly defined in terms of population, interventions, comparators, outcomes and study designs (PICOS)

The search strategy was adequate and appropriate. There were no restrictions on language.

#publication status: unpublished papers and theses were assessed by asking experts. In addition, papers will be included if they are acceptable in terms of relevant data and quality analysis.

#Publication date: All available relevant studies published between 01/01/1980 and 30/06/2020 would be considered in this study.
#Preventative steps were taken to minimize bias and errors in the study selection process by using the Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias.
Appropriate criteria were used to assess the quality of the primary studies, and preventative steps were taken to minimize bias and errors in the quality assessment process
Appropriate methods were used for data synthesis

BUT
Authors' do not have any conclusions that reflect the evidence that was reviewed

Response: Thanks for your precision and comments. According to your comment, the conclusion section was added to the manuscript, (page 16, line 299-303), To read as follow: "The present systematic review and meta-analysis will assess the efficacy of aminophylline on the prevention and/or treatment of PDPH. Researchers and clinicians are expected to benefit from the results of this study since they will be able to use the findings of the study to manage PDPH. The results of this study will be reported in publications and presentations at conferences."

And also was added to the abstract (page 2, line 23-24), To read as follow: It is expected that the results of this study will be of benefit to researchers and clinicians for managing PDPH, and will be reported in conferences and publications.

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) 17 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
The author could correct the majority of requested items. They should update the references.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 2021

Dear EIC
Based on reviewers' comments this revised format need some corrections at references section.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 17 Oct 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 and Reviewers

We highly appreciate for your detailed and valuable comments on our manuscript (No.: 119674, Entitled; Aminophylline for prevention and/or Treatment of Post-dural Puncture Headache: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis, Study Protocol). We are grateful to the reviewers for their insightful comments on our paper. The suggestions were quite helpful for us and we incorporated them in the revised paper. We had referred to literatures and reconstructed the manuscript which is provided in below. The changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow.

Response to the Reviewer #1

Comment 1.

Dear Editor in Chief

Author could correct the majority of requested items. Please up-date the references.

Sincerely

Response:

Thanks for your comments. All references were updated base on your comment.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Comment 1.

Dear Editorial

Based on reviewers' comments this revised format need some corrections at references section.

Regards

AE

Response:

Thanks for your comments. The references section was revised and updated.

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) — 26 Oct 2021

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 26 Oct 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) — 26 Oct 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.