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.121809
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(1) ; e121809

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of the Relationship Between Changes in Potassium Concentration and Arrhythmia During Coronary Artery Bypass Grafting Surgery"

Author(s): Sara Jorairahmadi, Fatemeh Javaherforooshzadeh, Farahzad Jannatmakan, Farhad Soltani, Liah Shidel Zadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Dec 2021
Revised Date:	17 Feb 2022
Accepted Date:	27 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 : EIC

7 Jan 2022

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.

:Reviewer 1

:Study review of

Prevalence of Potassium Concentration Disorders and Its Relationship With Cardiac Rhythm Disorders in Patients With Coronary Artery Bypass Graft at Golestan Hospital in Ahvaz in 2020

The title of the article should be modified according to the results of this study - for example: Evaluation of the relationship between changes in potassium concentration and arrhythmia during coronary artery bypass graft surgery

The title of the article was modified according to the results of this study

Write a code of ethics-

The code of ethics was mentioned

Modify the method in the abstract section and point out the important points of - .the method

The method in the abstract section was modified

In the background section, explain the role of potassium in causing arrhythmia

This was explained

In the method section, the induction method of anesthesia and maintenance should be mentioned

In the method section, the induction method of anesthesia and maintenance were mentioned

In the results section, it should be noted that the changes in the measured factors at the times specified in the article were relative to the baseline value or each .time was relative to the previous time

.This was corrected According to repeated measure ANOVA test

In the results section, a diagram related to these changes and its relationship with arrhythmia should be drawn, and according to the diagram, it should be .determined with how much changes these arrhythmias have been more

The diagram of changes according to arrhythmic and non-arrhythmic patients was drawn in figure 1

If possible, indicate the type of arrhythmias

Was added data of two major class of arrhythmia in table 3

Delete the name of center and year at title

The name of center and year at title were deleted

All evaluation criteria must be carefully stated in the Method

All evaluation criteria were stated in the Method

The author should ONLY mention the results of the evaluation criteria in the Results, which is in the Method

This was mentioned in method sections

Results should not contain data that is not mentioned in the Method

Results section was corrected

Only the tenth decimal data should be mentioned and one hundredth should be deleted (i.e. instead of 149.25±87.841, ONLY mention 149.2±87.8)

All data were corrected

References need corrections, and only valid references should be mention (Cited at PubMed, Scopus, and NOT Persian)

.References completely were corrected

The English text needs to be revised

The English text completely was revised

:Reviewer 2

In this cross-sectional study the authors tried to find the relation ship between K ,levels and arrhythmias during CABG

The main issue is in statistical analyses! authors must define arrhythmias precisely and the divided the studied patients in the two groups of with and without arrhythmias and the compare electrolyte status in these two groups in .different time intervals

The two group of study and results were mentioned in figure 1

Witch statistical test you used for achieve relationship between the trend of changes in electrolyte levels (K, Na, Ca, Mg, BUN / Cr) and mean arterial blood .pressure (MAP) and blood sugar (BS) with the occurrence of arrhythmia

Furthermore, test such as correlation and regression analysis were done but because there were not detect any correlation we the authors avoids to report data

In method section you stated that all ABG and electrolytes were measured in 20 min intervals while you only showed 5 measurements in average 5 hours of CABG operation!!-

Was corrected in method section

Full English edit is needed -

the manuscript was edited

Your all K, Na, Ca, Mg, BUN / Cr) and (MAP) and (BS) levels were within normal levels during CABG, how you find relationship between electrolytes disturbance and arrhythmias?!-

Dear reviewer according to high rate of incidences of arrhythmia in CABG surgery this type of operation was selected for this study. Although main purpose of this study was analyzing K level and relation with arrhythmia but secondary out-comes such as Na, Ca and … was mentioned in this manuscript

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.

:Reviewer 1

Author tried to reply to requested to the items, but references section need to be up-date

: Answer

References section were up-dated and we have added your suggested references

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Farnad Imani : EIC

27 Feb 2022

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.