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-127356
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(5) ; e127356

Peer Review Report for "Worsening COVID-19 Disease Course After Surgical Trauma: A Case Series"

Author(s): Quinten Cuypers, Vincent Vandebergh, Bjorn Stessel, Ina Callebaut, Ilse Depauw, Vera Saldien, Dirk Vrancken

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	30 Apr 2022
Revised Date:	28 Jul 2022
Accepted Date:	19 Oct 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.

Hasselt, July 26th, 2022

Manuscript ID: 127356
Title: Worsening COVID-19 disease course after surgical trauma: a case series
To:
Professor Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh
Editor-in-chief, Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine

Dear professor Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh

Please find herewith our revised manuscript entitled “Worsening COVID-19 disease course after surgical trauma: a case series”.
We would like to thank all reviewers for the constructive comments on our manuscript. We have followed the very helpful suggestions from reviewers and incorporated a number of improvements based on our response to the reviewers suggestions and comments. These revisions are marked up using the “Track Changes” function.

Point by point response to reviewer comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Author,

it was a good study with practical results. However, if done on larger number, it could produce more valid results.

Thanks.

Response:

We would like to thank the reviewer for this valuable comment. We agree that additional studies are necessary, however, this is beyond the scope our case series.

Reviewer 2:
Dear associate editor
The manuscript "Worsening COVID-19 disease course after surgical trauma: a case
series "was reviewed.
Thanks to the esteemed authors, in my opinion, considering the article's value, it is better to make changes in the parts of the abstract and introduction before publishing.
A duplicate text has been used in the abstract and introduction sections.
Please write an abstract including the objectives and context of the research, case study, discussion, and conclusion.

Also, in the introduction, the goals and context of the study should be given in more detail and more completely.

The article's discussion is very well done, the references are well used and the conclusion is valid and practical.
Respectfully,

Response:

We would like to thank the reviewer for this valuable comments and we followed the suggestions of the reviewer.

An abstract was added to the article comprising a background, objective, results, discussion and conclusion section.

Moreover, the goals and context of the study were elaborated in the introduction section on page 2 of the revised manuscript.

> Associate Editor's Comments:
Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC
Thanks to the respected authors and you, the article "Worsening COVID-19 disease course after surgical trauma: a case series", which was reviewed by two of our reviewers is a valuable guide for most anesthesiologists but needs a revision by the authors. It is hoped that the article will be suitable for printing once the bugs and objections raised by the reviewers are resolved.
respectfully,

Response:

We would like to thank the associate editor for the valuable comment. We have adapted the manuscript according to the remarks and suggestions of the reviewers.

We hope you are satisfied with our revised manuscript. We think our paper has improved significantly and would like to thank the reviewers for that.

Looking forward to the decision,

Kind regards,

On behalf of all co-authors

Dirk Vranken, MD

Correspondence:

Dirk Vranken

Jessa Hospital, Hasselt
Department of Anesthesiology & Pain treatment
Stadsomvaart 11
3500 Hasselt

Belgium

Dirk.vranken@jessazh.be

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 19 Oct 2022

Dear Associate Editor
Thanks to the authors,
The revised manuscript was reviewed. The title, abstract, introduction, case report, discussion, and conclusion are well-written. The bugs of the initial version were fixed and revised properly. In my opinion, the article is acceptable for publication.
With respect,

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 19 Oct 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC — 19 Oct 2022

Dear Author,
Thank you for revising the manuscript. It is acceptable now.