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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine
Article DOI: 10.5812/aapm.99229
Published in: Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine: 10(2); e99229

Peer Review Report for "A Brief Review on the Relationship Between Pain and Sociology"

Author(s): Nader D. Nader, Haleh Farzin, Hanieh Sakha

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 1 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 19 Mar 2020

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) — 22 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
This is a good article.
Effects of social, behavioral and emotional factors on pain - specially chronic pain - is irrefutable.
The Author in brief and advantageous sentences has explained effectively the correlation of pathophysiology of pain with the other factors that so many times have been forgotten.
In my opinion, this Letter needs no changes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jan 2020

Deere EIC
Based on reviewer comments this manuscript will be accepted.
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 9 Jan 2020

Dear Author

Please correct and complete your two last paragraphs

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.

Reviewer 1:
This is a good article.
Effects of social, behavioral and emotional factors on pain - specially chronic pain - is irrefutable.
The Author in brief and advantageous sentences has explained effectively the correlation of pathophysiology of pain with the other factors that so many times have been forgotten.
In my opinion, this Letter needs no changes.

Thank you

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Deere EIC
Based on reviewer comments this manuscript will be accept.
Please correct and complete two last paragraphs before publishing as below:
(The effect of chronic pain non- related to cancer is a serious public health issue…..". . . Lack of awareness about chronic pain management
among general population."
". . . .Society is immature for pain specialty." (8).)
Regards

Ok, checked and corrected

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 4 Feb 2020

Dear Author

Please correct the reviewer's request. In this revised format, there are no changes.

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.

Reviewer 1:
This is a good article.
Effects of social, behavioral and emotional factors on pain - specially chronic pain - is irrefutable.
The Author in brief and advantageous sentences has explained effectively the correlation of pathophysiology of pain with the other factors that so many times have been forgotten.
In my opinion, this Letter needs no changes.

Thank you

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Deere EIC
Based on reviewer comments this manuscript will be accept.
Please correct and complete two last paragraphs before publishing as below:
(The effect of chronic pain non- related to cancer is a serious public health issue…..". . . Lack of awareness about chronic pain management
among general population."
". . . .Society is immature for pain specialty." (8).)
Regards

Ok, checked and corrected

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) 19 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The revised manuscript #99229 was reviewed, and author could correct the final requested items.
Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 19 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
Based on reviewer comments this brief report was changed by the author and it can be considered for publishing
Regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 19 Mar 2020

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