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.105542
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(2); e105542

Peer Review Report for "Normo-Calcemic Tetany in a Patient with Hypokalemic Periodic Paralysis of Sjogren's Syndrome: Neuromuscular Excitability Secondary to the 'Forgotten Cation'"

Author(s): Urmila Anandh, Pradeep Mishra, Hilal Malla

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 23 May 2020
Revised Date: 31 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 29 May 2021

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)

2 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
The authors described a case of quadriparesis that laboratory evaluation detected hypokalemia. Moreover, Carpopedal spasm revealed hypomagnesemia. Therefore, with the impression of interstitial nephritis autoimmune antibodies were assessed which suggested Sjogren's syndrome. The following points should be considered by the authors:
1- At the abstract, it is mentioned as follows: "a case of Sjogren's syndrome presented to our hospital.."; however, it was not a known case and as mentioned it was diagnosed in the hospital. No more information is provided about signs and symptoms of Sjogren in the current patient.
2- It would be better to provide the exact value of potassium and magnesium, in the text instead of the table, so that the reader could comprehend properly.
Thanks.

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

5 Sep 2020

Dear AE,

The authors presented a case of Normo-calcemic tetany and hypokalemic periodic paralysis in a patient with Sjogren's Syndrome. Although the case has interesting clinical and laboratory findings, it is not novel and has been reported in the past several times. As an example , reference 13 by Selvaganesh M etal. published in 2013 is very similar.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Sep 2020

Dear EIC,
This manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Sep 2020

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
The authors described a case of quadriparesis that laboratory evaluation detected hypokalemia. Moreover, Carpopedal spasm revealed hypomagnesemia. Therefore,with impression of interstitial nephritis autoimmune antibodies were assessed which suggested Sjogren's syndrome. The following points should be considered:

1- At the abstract, it is mentioned as follow: "a case of Sjogren's syndrome presented to our hospital.."; however, it was not a known case and as mentioned it was diagnosed in the hospital. No more information is provided about signs and symptoms of Sjogren in the current patient.

Thank you very much for your comments,A mention of her signs and symptoms are added in the case report (Page 3 ,Line 6)

2- It would be better to provide the exact value of potassium and magnesium, in the text instead of table, so that the reader could comprehend properly.

Added in the paper itself.

Reviewer 2:
The authors presented a case of Normo-calcemic tetany and hypokalemic periodic paralysis in a patient with Sjogren's Syndrome. Although the case has interesting clinical and laboratory findings, it is not novel and has been reported in the past several times. As an example , reference 13 by Selvaganesh M etal. published in 2013 is very similar.

Thank you very much for your comments.We do agree that it is not anovel presentation , but it is not a common presentation of normocalcemic tetatny.

Hypokalemic periodic paralysis is common .

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) 29 May 2021

Dear AE,
The authors have provided recommended modifications.
Therefore, it is acceptable in my opinion.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 May 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 May 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.