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-131795
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(6) ; e131795

Peer Review Report for "Intraoperative Awareness in Patients Undergoing Cardiac Surgery in an Academic Center in the North of Iran"

Author(s): Vali Imantalab, Ali Mohammadzadeh Jouryabi, Abbas Sedighinejad, Mahboobeh Gholipour, Leila Kanafi Vahed, Seyed Sadegh Zargar-Nattaj, Gelareh Biazar, Neda Shadkam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	24 Sep 2022
Revised Date:	21 Nov 2022
Accepted Date:	21 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

8 Nov 2022

The purpose of this research was to determine how often the risk of awareness during general anesthesia was observed during cardiac surgery at a university hospital in Iran. The registered patients in 2022 at the hospital were interviewed based on some predesigned questionnaires. All in all 322 patients were analyzed and 14 of them experienced the risk of awareness during general anesthesia.

In my point of view, the results of the submitted manuscript can be considered interesting, but the authors are required to address the following comments to improve the quality and readability of the paper:

1. The authors provide some background on the preceding linked metrics in the last paragraph of the introduction (references 8 and 3). Please elaborate on these so that the readers have a thorough understanding of the present situation and your rationale.
2. The author(s) provide insufficient information on the statistical methodologies used. Give a thorough justification for using the aforementioned tests, specifying which variables they were applied to.
3. Did you find any gaps in the data set that might have affected the results of your study? Please elaborate on your approach if so.
4. In the opening paragraph of the results section, please provide some short information on the patients' demographic characteristics (table 1).
5. Please provide the reasons for non-participation at each level in the results section.
6. Please use a flowchart to show how patients were recruited from the beginning of the research to its end.

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor

12 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC

12 Nov 2022

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on comments. Also, you should reply to reviewers comments one by one.

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 EIC, thanks for the review process. We did our best to revise the paper according to the respected reviewers' comments. The revised parts have been highlighted.

Reviewer 1:
The manuscript lacks the following items:
1- what is the novelty?

Thanks for the valuable comment, done and highlighted.

2- how the sample size has been calculated

Thanks, done
3- how many anesthesiologists and surgeons were involved in the clinical case management?

In order to prevent the influence of the surgeon's expertise and surgical technique on the results, all surgeries were performed by a single heart surgeon. Regarding the anesthesia method, a standard protocol was performed in all patients.

4- what was the protocol for anesthesia, surgery, and CPB?

Thanks for the valuable comment, done and highlighted

I think these are significant gaps in the study.
Reviewer 2:
The purpose of this research was to determine how often the risk of awareness during general anesthesia was observed during cardiac surgery at a university hospital in Iran. The registered patients in 2022 at the hospital were interviewed based on some predesigned questionnaires. All in all 322 patients were analyzed and 14 of them experienced the risk of awareness during general anesthesia.
In my point of view, the results of the submitted manuscript can be considered interesting, but the authors are required to address the following comments to improve the quality and readability of the paper:
1. The authors provide some background on the preceding linked metrics in the last paragraph of the introduction (references 8 and 3). Please elaborate on these so that the readers have a thorough understanding of the present situation and your rationale.

Thanks, Done
2. The author(s) provide insufficient information on the statistical methodologies used. Give a thorough justification for using the aforementioned tests, specifying which variables they were applied to.

Thanks done

3. Did you find any gaps in the data set that might have affected the results of your study? Please elaborate on your approach if so.

No gaps were found in data set.

4. In the opening paragraph of the results section, please provide some short information on the patients' demographic characteristics (table 1).

Thanks done

5. Please provide the reasons for non-participation at each level in the results section.

According to the nature of this study, the unwillingness of the patients to participate in the research was only at the stage of the initial interview with the patients before induction of anesthesia. This issue has been explained in the results section and highlighted.

6. Please use a flowchart to show how patients were recruited from the beginning of the research to its end.

This issue was explained in the results section, but since this article is not a clinical trial, it was not possible to provide a flow chart.

WARM REGARDS

GELAREH BIAZAR MD

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : Reviewer — 21 Nov 2022

Dear author(s),
Thank you very much for the revisions. In my opinion, in the revised version of the submitted manuscript, all my comments have been considered and addressed in the revision by the author(s). Thank you again for your efforts to enhance the quality of the manuscript.
Best regards
Reviewer

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 21 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC — 21 Nov 2022

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