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.101946
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(2); e101946

Peer Review Report for "Statistical Comparison of Stroke Patients Visiting an Emergency Department During Summer Versus Winter: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Author(s): Mohammad Mehdi Forouzanfar, Atefeh Sepehrirad, Kamran Heydari, Sahar Mirbaha

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Feb 2020
Revised Date: 11 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 16 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.

Alireza Baratloo: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
I received the paper as a reviewer. It seems that the author had performed a seasonal comparative study on stroke patients referred to a single medical center. Overall, despite considerable limitations, the paper contains valuable data for presentation, but not enough for an original paper. So I recommend the paper to be accepted as a brief report, after proper English edition.
Kind Regards.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 11 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

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

11 Mar 2020

Dear AUthor,

Your manuscript may be accepted after revision as a brief report.

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

Journal: Archives of Neuroscience

Manuscript ID: 101946

Title: Statistical comparison of stroke patients visiting an emergency department during the summer versus winter; a cross-sectional study

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Dear Authors
I received your paper as a reviewer. It seems that you had performed a seasonal comparative study on stroke patients referred to a single medical center. Overall, despite considerable limitations, your paper contains valuable data for presentation, but not enough for an original paper. So I recommend your paper to be accepted as a brief report, after proper English edition.
Kind Regards

Dear reviewer

With respect to your we have summarized the main text to less than 1500 words and send it as a brief report.

Sincerely yours

Corresponding Author

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.

Alireza Baratloo: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 15 Mar 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 16 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.