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.105932
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(4); e105932

Peer Review Report for "More Attention to Spinal Cord Injury Patients During COVID-19 Pandemic"

Author(s): Seyede Zahra Emami Razavi, Maryam Hosseini, Mohaddeseh Azadvari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 May 2020
Revised Date: 19 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 21 Jul 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) — 30 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
I received the paper as a reviewer. In my opinion, the recommendations are so valuable, but there is a bit of discontinuity in the text. I suggest you at least remove the first paragraph; easily and directly point to possible disruption of continuous rehabilitation of spinal cord injury patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. Letters usually do not need any abstract and the whole text or first part (depend on the publisher) is going to be published as an abstract. All in all, the final decision will be made by the EIC.
Kind Regard

Abdorreza Naser Moghadasi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 11 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
It is a valuable manuscript but needs some revisions before publication:
1- The authors should discuss the cause of spinal injury and its effect on rehabilitation recommendations.
2- Telemedicine is an important subject in this issue. The authors should discuss the telemedicine and importance of online rehabilitation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs minor revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Jul 2020

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.

7/18/2020

Dear Editor of "Archive of neuroscience journal"

We thank you and your peer review team for revising our manuscript.

We corrected our manuscript according your valuable comments and highlighted it in the text and resubmited it.

Reviewer 1:
We thank a lot and according your comment we omitted abstract and rewrite the first part of letter.

Reviewer 2:
With thanks a lot, we rewrited the first part according with your valuable comment, with more explanation about SCI, rehabilitation and tele rehabilitation.

Corresponding author: Dr Azadvari

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.

Abdorreza Naser Moghadasi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 21 Jul 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) 21 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 21 Jul 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.