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-122735
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(3) ; e122735

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Intravenous Dexmedetomidine on Shivering in Cesarean Section under Intrathecal Anesthesia: Randomized Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Sholeh Nesionpour, Soraya Bayat, Ali ghomeishi, Kaveh Behaeen, Mohsen Savaie, Azar Ahmadzadeh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	18 Jan 2022
Revised Date:	30 Apr 2022
Accepted Date:	1 May 2022

Revision (0)

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

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 of APM
First of all let me thank you so much for giving us opportunity to revise our work. Kindly, the manuscript is revised based on reviewers' comments and highlighted in the text as follows:

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor in Chief
Many thanks for sending this manuscript for peer review. I have gone through the manuscript and for increasing the scientific importance of this article, some corrections need to be made
- Title need to be revised.
Authors' response: The title is revised based on your kindly recommendations.

- The abstract of the article does not fully reflect the content of the entire text and needs to be revised.
Authors' response: It was revised. You can find the revised abstract on Page 1.

- The whole Text should be rewritten as there are many grammatical errors.
Authors' response: The text was revised and grammatical errors were corrected across many pages.

- In the method, more explanations and details are needed. About the hospital, surgeon, adverse events, the reason for choosing this dosage of dexmedetomidine and etc.
Authors' response: The kind of hospital was added. All of surgeries were done by one surgeon. Adverse events were added. The reason for choosing dosage of DEX was using of an effective dose with less side effects was explained on pages 1&2 in the Method section.

- add more references for improving the quality of your work
Authors' response: More references were added and highlited.

Reviewer 2:
Dear AE
Thanks for your kind invitation, I peered this paper with interest and following are my comments.
-In abstract section, it should be noted that when and where this study was conducted.
Authors' response: It was added on page 1 and lines 10&11.
-In introduction section, the current pharmacologic and non-pharmacologic preventive strategies, should be discussed and reach to the necessity of this work.
Authors' response: thank a lot, it was discussed briefly in introduction Introduction section on page 1and lines 44-50.

-In method section, it should be noted that based on which document this dosage of dexmedetomidine has been chosen?
Authors' response: Thanks for your attention. Based on the other studies and having an effective dose with less side effects this dosage of DEX was chosen.

-Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be revised. Many other criteria could be added. Such as any contraindication of SA or the studied drug. Informed consent and other.
Authors' response: More inclusion-exclusion criteria were added in Method section paragraph 1.
Why ages above 35 were excluded?
Authors' response : Because most of first and second pregnancies occur before the age of 35.

-The characteristics of the hospital where this survey was conducted should be noted. Referral?, general? , tertiary? Academic?, governmental ?and other?
Authors' response: The hospital is a governmental hospital. It's been added and highlighted in Abstract section on page 1 and in the Method section on page 2.

-In blinding process, the patient should always be blinded.
Authors' response: You are correct. It has been clarified. It was noted in Method section on page 2.

-All the surgeries should be performed by a single surgeon to avoid the effects of surgery method and surgeon's' experience on the results.
Authors' response: All of surgeries were done by one surgeon. It's been added to the manuscript on page 2, in the Method section, paragraph 3.

-The first lines of discussion section should be deleted it is the repeat of method section.
Authors' response: It was deleted.

-It should be noted that which adverse events were expected and the way of their management.
Authors' response: It was added in paragraph 5 in Method section.

-This section in this format is just like a report from other studies, while it should be a challenging section comparing the result of other studies with yours and discuss about the reason of similarities and differences. To revise this section a studding a similar work is strongly recommended. Published online 2021 Aug 2. doi: 10.5812/aapm.116429
Authors' response: The mentioned article was studied and Discussion section was revised.
-The tables 2,3,4 should be completely revised. A column as p-value should be added for all the compressions.
"a: There is a significant difference (at the level of 0.05) between two groups
b: There is a significant difference (at the level of 0.05) compared to the previous time point in the same group "Is not informative and sufficient.
Authors' response: P-value columns were added. The tables were revised.

-New references should be added. The number of the references is limited as well.
Authors' response: new references were added and highlighted on pages 7 and 8.

-The manuscript is full of grammatical defects and should be revised by someone expert in English.
Authors' response: It was revised and grammatical errors were corrected.

REGARDS
Reviewer 3:
Dear Researcher
I read your manuscript (The effect of DEXMEDETOMIDINE on Shivering after Intrathecal anesthesia in Cesarean Section)
In the review of the article, some points for correction are mentioned.
Title: Choose a more interesting article title

Abstract: In the summary of the article, it is better to explain the methodology more precisely.
Authors' response: Abstract was revised on page 1.
The results of the study are changed according to the method.
Authors' response: It was changed (page 7 ,paragraph 2).
Introduction: In the introductory part, the focus will be on the mechanism of action of dexmedetomidine on shivering. The use of more up-to-date references is recommended.
Authors' response: It was added on page 1&2.

Method:
Grammatical errors still exist in the method section.
Did patients receive only bolus doses?
Or did they receive a maintenance dose?
Authors' response: They received maintenance dose and highlighted on page 2, in the Method Section, in the third paragraph. The grammatical errors were corrected.

The numbers listed in the tables are not verifiable. The errors were probably in the original text. It is recommended to prepare them again and correctly
Authors' response: The tables were revised.

How much was the patients' need for pethidine estimated?
Authors' response: It was 0.5 mg/kg and highlighted in the text.

What is the difference between severity of shivering and level of shivering? Are they both the same concept? Be defined.
Authors' response: they are same and was corrected.

Discussion:
Extensive grammatical and writing problems are quite evident in the discussion, which need to be fundamentally reconsidered.(for example;222-224)
Authors' response: It was revised.

Conclusions based on the study cannot be generalized and should be expressed with caution.
Authors' response: It was noted and highlighted on page 7.

Lines 231-235 should be written according to the discussion pattern.
Authors' response: It was revised.

Use up-to-date references if possible
Authors' response: It was added and highlighted on pages 7&8.

Warm Regards
Reviewer 4:
Dear Editor in Chief
There are some comments which need to be considered:
First of all the title seems not to be written completely and something seems to be missing.
Authors' response: It was revised and highlighted.
All the verbs should be written in past sentences in abstract.
Authors' response: It was revised on page 2 paragraph 1.

In introduction add the importance and necessity of doing the research.
Authors' response: It was added on page 1&2.

In Method add the explanation of how Intervening variables were controlled.
Authors' response: It was added and highlighted in the text on page 2&3.

In statistical Analysis rectify the name of the tests which have been used(Mann-Whitney u test)
Authors' response: It was revised 0n page 3.

In Results mention the name of the statistical tests have been used in each part
Authors' response: It was added at the bottom of the tables.

The title of the tables need to be revised (for example table 2,3)
Authors' response: It was revised on pages 4&5.

All tables need redesign (and P value).
Authors' response: They were revised and p-value columns were added.

In the vertical column (Group), rows Dex and Control for each criterion are moved to the subcategories of horizontal columns HR, SBP and DBP.

This means that for all three vertical columns, both data Dex and Control should be written as vertical columns.
This should be observed for Tables 2, 3 and 4.
Mention P value at separate vertical column.
Delete one hundredths decimal.
The scores should be correct in the tables (instead of "/" used dots"."
Authors' response: It was revised and errors were corrected.
The whole discussion need to be revised. The present study had some other interesting results which have been neglected in the discussion.

Authors' response: Discussion section was revised on pages 6 and 7.

In Conclusion it is mentioned" Also, systolic and diastolic blood pressure in the dexmedetomidine group was less than the placebo group. Although the scores in table 2 and the report in abstract shows the opposite. Please check the accuracy of it.
Authors' response: It was corrected.

The whole manuscript should be revised grammatically and considering English structure.
Authors' response: It was corrected and highlighted on page7.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : EIC

22 Apr 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 editor of APM

First of all, let me thank you so much for giving us opportunity to revise our work. Kindly, the manuscript is revised based on reviewers' comments and highlighted in the text as follow:

Adding the suggested references was done.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

REFEREE : EIC

1 May 2022

Accept