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.121267
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(1) ; e121267

Peer Review Report for "Ultrasound-Guided Clavipectoral Block for Postoperative Analgesia of Clavicular Surgery: A Prospective Randomized Trial"

Author(s): Motaz Amr Abu Sabaa, Amr Arafa Elbadry, Dina Ahmed El Malla

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 Nov 2021
Revised Date:	12 Feb 2022
Accepted Date:	13 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

4 Dec 2021

dear authors
I read your valuable manuscript and found some pitfalls:
page 5 paragraph 5: about induction of general anesthesia
1. fentanyl dosage was 1 microgram?!!
fentanyl premedication dosage for intubation should be about 2 to 6 microgram per kilogram.
2. cisatracurium:0.5 mg/kg for intubation is incorrect and the correct dosage is about 0.2 mg/kg

you didn't imply to total opioid dosage used during the period of general anesthesia !
did you compared or standardized both groups in this regard?

REFEREE : Reviewer

24 Dec 2021

Dear AE
I was read the manuscript “Ultrasound Guided Clavipectoral Block for Postoperative Analgesia of Clavicular Surgery: Prospective Randomized Trial” and in my opinion the study has a good structure and design and all aspects of clinical trial study observed well and my decision is accept.
Thank you

REFEREE : EIC

7 Jan 2022

Minor 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.

- Q1: [- *Figures the Figures should be uploaded as separate files in the journal website.*]
- R: [*Figures were uploaded separately*]

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : EIC

8 Feb 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.

- Q1: [Was the dose of Fentanyl for induction 2 mcg?!]
- R: [fentanyl 2 mcg] Page 3, line 78.
- Q1: [Merge tables 3, 4, and 5.]
- R: [Done] Page 13.
- Q1: [Mention unit for tramadol (table 3)]
- R: [mg] Page 13.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Farnad Imani : EIC

13 Feb 2022

Dear Authors,
We are pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication.