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-131184
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(5) ; e131184

Peer Review Report for "Effects of Fentanyl Versus Remifentanil Pretreatment on the QTc Interval in Patients Undergoing Rapid Sequence Intubation: A Randomized Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Seyedpouya Paknezhad, Elaheh Serati, Robab Mehdizadeh Esfanjani, Maryam Soleimanpour, Hassan Soleimanpour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 Aug 2022
Revised Date:	5 Nov 2022
Accepted Date:	16 Nov 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 — 7 Oct 2022

Dear Authors:
please Writing of the References with Vancouver style
References should be for the last five years

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 8 Oct 2022

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor

revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC

8 Oct 2022

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested. Thanks.

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 in chief

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise our paper entitled "Effects of Fentanyl versus Remifentanil pretreatment on the QTc interval in patients undergo rapid sequence intubation: A Randomized Clinical Trial" for potential publication in *Anesth Pain Med*. We are grateful to the reviewers and the Editor for their constructive and positive comments on our paper. We have addressed each of the comments in our revision, which has further improved the article. Below we detail our changes and respond to each of the comments in turn.

Here are the authors' answers to reviewers' questions:

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Dear Reviewer 1
I appreciate you for reviewing our manuscript so meticulously and mentioning very important comments. Below you could find our reply to your comments.

Q1: *The age range is very wide. Age can be a confounding factor.*

A1: We appreciate your precise comment. Although the mentioned age range is wide, the number of people with high and low age was only one or two people (The distribution of age in two groups was normal). Also, in the statistical comparison between the two groups in terms of age, no statistically significant difference was observed, which indicates that the two groups are similar in terms of age distribution.

Q2: W*hat was the reason and scientific basis that you did this study? Please clear that in introduction and discussion.*

A2: Thank you for your careful and meticulous opinion. As we mentioned in introduction section, long QT is an adverse effect of laryngoscopy which can have serious outcomes such as critical dysrhythmias. Opioids like fentanyl and remifentanil are used to attenuate sympathetic tone and decries the risk of this adverse effect. There are few studies comparing these two drugs in terms of this issue so we conduct this study.

Q3: *How did you double-blinded the trial?*

A3: Thanks for your comment. Blinding method added to Method section.

Q4: *The discussion section is not related to the topic, you did not talk about your topic and similar studies*

A4: I really appreciate you for your comprehensive comments. due to the lack of similar studies, its practically impossible to compare the present study with other studies. However, the comparison between other effects of these drugs was mentioned in the discussion section. Regarding the effect of these two drugs on the QT interval, we found only one similar study which has been discussed in discussion section.

Dear Reviewer 2
I appreciate you for reviewing our manuscript so meticulously and mentioning very important comments. Below you could find our reply to your comments.

Q1: *please writing of the References with Vancouver style*

References should be for the last five years

A1: We appreciate your accurate attention. References were rewritten based on the Vancouver style. Due to the lack of similar studies, its practically impossible to compare the present study with other studies. However, the comparison between other effects of these drugs was mentioned in the discussion section. Regarding the effect of these two drugs on the QT interval, we found only one similar study which has been discussed in discussion section.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 6 Nov 2022

The reforms were well done.

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 16 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript revised successfully.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC — 16 Nov 2022

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