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 "**Open 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:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.91182
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 9(6); e91182

Peer Review Report for "Prevalence of Chronic Orofacial Pain in Elderly Patients Referred to Shiraz Dental School From 2005 to 2017"

Author(s): Reza Derafshi, Fahimeh Rezazadeh, Janan Ghapanchi, Delaram Basandeh Sharif, Mitra Farzin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Mar 2019
Revised Date: 2 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 24 Oct 2019

Revision (0)

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Jun 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks for inviting me.
I read the manuscript and here you can find the comments:
1- Abbreviation in an abstract section should be rewritten according to journal rules.
2- Please enter the study type in methods.
3- It needs grammar rewriting.
4- Results: What does it mean: In BMS patients, emotional factors were found in a large group (54.4%),. Describe it more precisely.
5- Rewrite the results in a separate table.
6- Please describe more about the used drugs in this study and type of pharmacotherapy plus dosage.
Also please mention the duration of drug therapy.
7- The references should refresh again. Please omit references before 2000.
Best

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Jul 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to the reviewers' request.

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.

Thanks for valid reviewing

All of these comments revised

1-Abbreviation in an abstract section revised.

2- study type enter.

3- grammar rewriting was done.if the certificate is necessary it will be send to you

4-Results revised

5- table was added.

6- used medications were added.

7-The references refresh again.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 14 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
My opinions are as follow:
1- In the abstract, conclusion part needs to be edited again.
2- "The informed consent was obtained from all patients", what this means in a retrospective study?
3- The manuscript needs to be edited again.
4- The method is incomplete and needs to be explained.
5- What is the role of laboratory and radiographic data in this study?
6- "Topical clonazepam", is it true?!
7- Did you perform any intervention for pain relief? Explain this.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 16 Aug 2019

Dear AE
There are still some points regarding this manuscript, it needs revision.
1- In the abstract, the conclusion part needs to be edited again.
2- "The informed consent was obtained from all patients", what this means in a retrospective study?
3- The manuscript needs to be edited again.
4- The method is incomplete and needs to be explained.
5- What is the role of laboratory and radiographic data in this study?
6- "Topical clonazepam", is it true?!
7- Did you perform any intervention for pain relief? Explain this.
Best.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 16 Aug 2019

Dear EIC
Thanks for inviting me.
The manuscript needs Revision again.
Best

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 16 Aug 2019

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 (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 reviewer

Thanks for your valuable comments

Q1-In abstract, conclusion part needs to be edited again.

R1- conclusion was edited

q2-"The informed consent was obtained from all patients", what this means in a retrospective study?

R2- this is a verbal consent form because of some extra questions that must be answered by patients (due to lack or vagueinformation)

q3-The manuscript needs to be edited again.

R3- if it is possible your editorial team edit this article for better result.

q4-The method is incomplete and needs to be explained.

R4- method was completed

q5-what is the role of laboratory and radiographic data in this study?

R5-this data need for better diagnosis at time of file completing (for rule outing other brain tumor or MS or arthritis temporalis)

Q6-"Topical clonazepam", is it true?!

R6- yes it is true. this is based on reference(Burket ,oral medicine text book).this means use clonazepam tablet on tongue for sucking.

Q7- Did you perform any intervention for pain relief? Explain this.

R7- we did not perform intervention but for all of patients at time of diagnosis , treatment was done.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 17 Sep 2019

Deat AE,
The authors requested from Journal staff to perform English edition on the manuscript.
If the edition will perform, the revised manuscript is ready for publication as a cross-sectional study.
Best

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 17 Sep 2019

Dear EIC
Thanks for the invitation. I read the revised manuscript and it is now ready for publication in terms of Scientific aspect but needs English edition which was requested by the author to be done by the journal.
Best

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 Sep 2019

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 (3)

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.

Reviewer 1:
Deat EIC
The authors requested from Journal staff to perform English edition on the manuscript.
If the edition will perform, the revised manuscript is ready for publication as a cross-sectional study.
Best

Answer:

Dear reviewer this article is edited by expert English editor and if it is needed we can send the certification for you.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear EIC
Thanks for the invitation. I read the revised manuscript and it is now ready for publication in terms of Scientific aspect but needs English edition which was requested by the author to be done by the journal.
Best

Answer:

Dear editor this article is edited by expert English editor and if it is needed we can send the certification for you.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (3) 24 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 24 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 24 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.