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-133192
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 12(6) ; e133192

Peer Review Report for "A Variation in Mask Ventilation in Edentulous Patients"

Author(s): Kamal Fani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	14 Nov 2022
Revised Date:	28 Nov 2022
Accepted Date:	30 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.

Ebrahim Espahbodi : Reviewer — 21 Nov 2022

Dear author
Is there any study about this method of ventilation?
Is it possible to send some figures?
How many cases did you perform this method successfully and what was the success rate?

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 21 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
This manuscript needs revision.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC

21 Nov 2022

Dear Author,

Please revise the manuscript based on comments.

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 reviewer

1- The closest research to the approach mentioned in my submit, done by Racine et al. (Reference number 5). Before him, Crooke (Crooke J: The bearded airway. Anesthesia 1999; 54:500) showed that placing the caudal end of the mask between the inferior lip and the alveolar ridge reduces air leak because a good seal forms around a significant part of the mask. While referring to Crook's method, Racine called himself method the “lower lip face mask placement”. In Racine's article, the details of his proposed method are given below:” the mask was changed to the lower lip placement by repositioning the caudal end of the mask above the lower lip while maintaining the head in extension”. In these explanations and other parts of his article including figs, there is no mention of putting the caudal part of the mask in the mouth and sealing the mouth with the mask. In addition, he emphasizes on doing two-handed ventilation, while in the method suggested by me, one-handed ventilation is easily done.
2- Two original images of performing mask ventilation comparing the intraoral method with the standard method in an elderly toothless patient scheduled for cardiac surgery are provided.
3- My study was not a clinical trial, although such a trial can be done in the future. However, dozens of cases have been performed by me and my colleagues with this method in elderly toothless patients with a near-complete success rate. The cases where this method has problems are mainly due to choosing the mask with a size that is disproportionately larger than necessary. I emphasize again that one of the biggest advantages of this method is the convenience of one-handed ventilation.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Sincerely

Corresponding author

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Parisa Bahmani : Associate Editor — 29 Nov 2022

Dear EIC,
The manuscript revise succesfully. It can be publish now.

Mahmood Reza Alebouyeh : EIC — 30 Nov 2022

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