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

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.101882
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(2); e101882

Peer Review Report for "Hypnotic Anesthesia for Blepharoplasty Surgery: A Case Report"

Author(s): Mehdi Fathi, Aliakbar Sabermoghaddam, Mohammad Hossein Azaraein, Marjan Joudi, Mohammad GharaviFard, Sara Khashkhashi Moghaddam

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 May 2020
Revised Date:	15 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	18 Mar 2021

Revision (0)

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

Hossein Majedi: Reviewer | Revision (0) 19 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the following manuscript entitled: “Hypnotic Anesthesia for Blepharoplasty Surgery: a Case Report”.
The author(s) have employed hypnosis to provide analgesia and sedation for the blepharoplasty operation. The procedure has been successfully performed under hypnosis. This report is valuable and has introduced a new method of analgesia/anesthesia for minor surgery. Meanwhile, I have a few comments for the authors:
1- Have you evaluated awareness/wakefulness during the surgery? In addition to analgesia, the patient should have adequate amnesia as well.
2- I would recommend that the authors evaluate the patient after a while to make sure that she is not affected by any psychological consequence(s).
3- The authors have reported that the patient had no complaint. It is a valuable observation. However, I would recommend that the authors measure the stress-response hormones (at least cortisol, GH, adrenaline, and noradrenaline) in their future studies during any surgery under hypnosis, and compare it with the conventional balanced anesthesia. This comparison will give us valuable information about the metabolic condition of the patients during the hypnosis and surgery.
With best regards,

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me to review the manuscript.
I should denote that the report of Hypnotic anesthesia is novel and interesting.
However, the following recommendation could be considered by the authors:
1- It is essential that the basics and pathophysiological mechanism of this kind of anesthesia be described clearly.
2- Most of the references are only case reports presenting one or two cases, although they are not sufficient and manuscripts with more valuable studies are required.
3- Some references such as no.11 were not accessible, checking all the references are needed.
4- The manuscript could be accepted after major revision.
Yours sincerely,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 18 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.
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.

Reply to Reviewer 1:

Q1: It is essential that the basics and pathophysiological mechanism of this kind of anaesthesia to be described clearly.

R1: It is added to the article in the discussion part.

Q 2: Most of the references are only case reports presenting one or two cases, although they are not sufficient and manuscripts with more valuable studies are required.

R2: References were revised and more valuable studies were used for the manuscript.

Q3: Some references such as no.11 were not accessible, checking all the references are needed.

R3: It was replaced by accessible one and all the references were re-checked.

Q4: the manuscript could be accepted after major revision.

R4: Thanks for your time and consideration.

Best Regards

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) 18 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable after revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Mar 2021

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