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.120658
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 11(5); e120658

Peer Review Report for "Supraclavicular vs. Infraclavicular Brachial Plexus Nerve Blocks: Clinical, Pharmacological, and Anatomical Considerations"

Author(s): Alan D. Kaye, Varsha Allampalli, Paul Fisher, Aaron J. Kaye, Aaron Tran, Elyse M. Cornett, Farnad Imani, Amber N. Edinoff, Soudabeh Djalali Motlagh, Richard D. Urman

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 27 Oct 2021

Accepted Date: 30 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
This submitted manuscript titled "Supraclavicular vs. Infraclavicular Brachial Plexus Nerve Blocks: Clinical, Pharmacological, and Anatomical Considerations" were reviewed. It has a good design. The principles of scientific writing are well observed. I did not find any problem with this article.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
I read with interest article ID#120658. These two regional anesthetic techniques (supraclavicular and infraclavicular nerves blockade) for upper extremity surgical operations have not yet found a good place among anesthesiologists. Addressing these two issues can be of great help in understanding them in patients' care. The authors seem to have been able to handle this well. The design of the study is well understood and the description was detail oriented. The subject was also somehow new and more practices need to be

done.
In my opinion, the study was almost perfect.
Best wishes

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

30 Oct 2021

Dear Editor in Chief
The article titled as "Supraclavicular vs. Infraclavicular Brachial Plexus Nerve Blocks: Clinical, Pharmacological, and Anatomical Considerations" was reviewed. Based on reviewers, this manuscript can be consider as accepted article in Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine Journal.
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

30 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.