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.96559
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 9(6); e96559

Peer Review Report for "Effect of Intravenous Propofol and Inhaled Sevoflurane Anesthesia on Postoperative Spirometric Indices: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Mohammad Hajijafari, Leila Mehrzad, Fatemah Sadat Asgarian, Hossein Akbari, Mohammad Hossein Ziloochi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 25 Sep 2019
Accepted Date: 30 Sep 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
This is a well-organized article that briefly explains the subject; however, some main items does not mentioned by the author:
1) Nowadays neuraxial anesthesia is used for surgeries such as inguinal hernia. Using general anesthesia with pulmonary effects, that you explained, doesn!t seem reasonable for inguinal hernia.
2) There are many articles with similar subject that were published before .this subject doe not have any creativity and innovation.
3) please add spirometry in keywords.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
I was pleased to have the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled 'Effect of

Intravenous Propofol and Inhaled Sevoflurane Anesthesia on
Post-operative Pulmonary Function: A Randomized Controlled Trial'. The manuscript is generally well written; Its novelty is questionable. I believe that it could be accepted for publication after major revision. My queries are followed.

1. Please write more specific and be more meticulous in the title and conclusion. Two indices of PFT does not mean 'pulmonary function'.
2. Introduction should be summarized to a great extent.
3. Discussion should be organized by topics not simply raw of literature review.
4. The net link to IRCT trial is erroneously mentioned. (Trial number is correct).
5. Conclusion should be rewritten objectively and based on study findings.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 30 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the invitation.
The manuscript requires major revision according to the reviewers' queries.
Best regards,
AE

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 31 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

Revisions Made Based on Comments of Reviewer 1

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Review Comment	Revision made
Please write more specific and be more meticulous in the title and conclusion. Two indices of PFT does not mean 'pulmonary function'	'pulmonary function' in title and conclusion was replaced by "spirometric indices". Also, 'pulmonary function' in keywords was replaced by the MeSH term "Respiratory Function Tests"
Introduction should be summarized to a great extent.	The number of words in Introduction section was decreased as about 25%.
Discussion should be organized by topics not simply raw of literature review.	We tried to compare our findings with other studies; however some revisions made in Disscussion section.
The net link to IRCT trial is erroneously mentioned. (Trial number is correct)	The link to IRCT was corrected.
Conclusion should be rewritten objectively and based on study findings.	Revised.

Revisions Made Based on Comments of Reviewer 2

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Review Comment	Revision made / Authors' comment
1) Nowadays neuroaxial anesthesia is used for surgeries such as inguinal hernia. Using general anesthesia with pulmonary effects ,that you explained, doesn!t seem reasonable for inguinal hernia.	This study focused on comparison between two methods of anesthesia (not finding the best method for inguinal hernia surgery); however to adjust the effect of surgery type on the anesthesia outcomes, we selected inguinal hernia (as a common surgery) to reach enough sample size. Also we selected this abdominal surgery to minimize the effect of surgery type and confounders on variables.
2) There are many articles with similar subject that were published before .this subject doe not have any creativity and	As you truly mentioned, many articles addressed this subject; however there are still controversies about the preferred method for

innovation.	anesthesia. Finding the method with less pulmonary complications can improve patient satisfaction and reduced hospitalization costs.
3) please add spirometry in keywords	“Spirometry” was added to keywords

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I appreciate the efforts of authors to improve their manuscript and believe that it merits publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 30 Sep 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.