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.97172
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 9(6); e97172

Peer Review Report for "Comparative Effect of Local Anesthesia with Lidocaine 2% Versus Topical Anesthesia on Cognitive Function in Ophthalmic Surgery"

Author(s): Wael Fathy, Mona Hussein, Hossam Khalil

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 13 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 18 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 25 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 5 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
1- The title of manuscript is imperfect and should be revised (ophthalmic surgery should be added).
2- The Keywords should be revised (cognitive function should be added).
3- Manuscript should be arranged according to this journal instruction.
4- Reference no.18 should be edited again.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I read this valuable article, and some questions and points are still in my mind;
1- "PLAT", "VF" and "ISAS" are not in MeSH as related to your manuscript.
2- Please rearrange the keywords in alphabetical order.
3- Please add "benoxinate " as a second name of oxybuprocaine for the first time use in your text and in keywords.

4- How did you blind the patient regarding the anesthesia method while injection is the key difference between the two methods?
5- Did your study approve ethically after the termination of sampling phase of it?!
6- Information in this manuscript and what I found in the Pan African Clinical Trials Registry aren't compatible, especially regarding the study period and inclusion and exclusion criteria.
7- How much lidocaine did you inject for local anesthesia (7 ml or 6 ml)?
8- Please clarify the method of topical anesthesia in this study.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (**0**)** 18 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewers comments this manuscript need some editing.
Final decision: MINOR REVISION.
Regards
AE

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (**0**)** 18 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 (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.

Letter to the editor

Dear Editor in chief "Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine"

We would like to thank the reviewers for their careful review and valuable comments of our manuscript.

Here are our replies and corrections point by point.

Reviewer's comments (1) (written in the manuscript in red color):

Comment 1:

The title of manuscript is imperfect and should be revised (ophthalmic surgery should be added).

Response:

"ophthalmic surgery" was added to the title of the manuscript

Comment 2:

The Keywords should be revised (cognitive function should be added)

Response:

Cognitive function was added to the key words

Comment 3:

Manuscript should be arranged according to this journal instruction

Response:

Manuscript was arranged according to the journal instruction

Comment 4:

Reference no.18 should be edited again.

Response:

Reference no.18 was edited

Reviewer's comments (2): (written in the manuscript in blue color):

Comment 1:

"PLAT", "VF" and "ISAS" are not in MeSH as related to your manuscript

Response:

"PALT", "VF" and "ISAS" are the scales we used in our study

Comment 2:

Please rearrange the keywords in alphabetical order.

Response:

Keywords were arranged in alphabetical order.

Comment 3:

Please add "benoxinate" as a second name of oxybuprocaine at the first time use in your text and in keywords.

Response:

We added “benoxinate" as a second name of oxybuprocaine at the first time use in the text and in keywords.

Comment 4:

How did you blind the patient regarding anesthesia method while injection is the key difference between two methods?

Response:

We didn’t blind the patient regarding anesthesia method.

Comment 5:

Did your study approve ethically after the termination of sampling phase of it?!

Response:

We obtained the ethical approval before we start the study

Comment 6:

Information in this manuscript and what I found in the Pan African Clinical Trials Registry aren’t compatible, especially regarding study period and inclusion and exclusion criteria

Response:

We actually changed the study period to recruit the required number of patients according to sample size calculation parameters. We also made some modification in the inclusion and exclusion criteria to achieve more proper selection of the patients to obtain more conclusive results.

Comment 7:

How much lidocaine did you inject for local anesthesia (7 ml or 6 ml)?

Response:

We injected 6 ml of lidocaine. We replaced the wrong number (7 mL) in the methodology by the correct one (6 mL).

Comment 8:

Please clarify the method of topical anesthesia in this study

Response:

We mentioned in the methodology section that topical anesthesia was done using Oxybuprocaine (benoxinate hydrochloride 0.4%) every 1 minute 3 times before the surgery.

We hope our reply would be satisfactory to the editor and our paper will get published in your highly esteemed journal.

Thanks,

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) 25 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me. The majority of problems in this revised manuscript was resolved. Therefore it is acceptable.
Sincerely yours

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 25 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
Based on reviewers' comments the requested items were corrected, and now it is ready for publishing.
Final decision: Acceptance
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 25 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.