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.105947
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(3); e105947

Peer Review Report for "Transpedicular or Transthoracic Approach: An Outcome Comparison Study on Patients with Neurological Manifestation"

Author(s): Mohammad Zarei, Furqan Mohammed Yaseen Khan, Mahdi Heshmatifar, Saied Besharaty, Mohammed Farah Mohamoud

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 24 Oct 2020
Accepted Date: 26 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.

Alireza Moharrami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
I reviewed the manuscript entitled " Transpedicular or transthoracic approach: an outcome comparison study in patients with neurological manifestation". I believe the subject of the article is very interesting, but there is no lack of knowledge in this regard. It is very important that the authors compared these two methods in patients with a specific manifestation (Foot drop) and make the subject more attractive. However, there are some points in this article that need further correction and explanation, including:
1- too many words and verbalizations have made your sentences difficult to follow, we recommend using article writing tools and Softwares to make shorter and more understandable phrases.
2- You must explain your method for evaluating the blood loss amount, please insert your formula and your method in the manuscript
3- Please explain the analysis tests which were used in your result or method sections
4- In the method section, please explain and write the setting of the study, is the intervention performed by a single surgeon in one center?
5- You must write about your ethical concern and your IRB approval in the method.
6- What is the indications for each approach? Do you have any criteria for choosing the

surgical approach? Please explain that
7- You say 2 patients had partial recovery, what do you mean about partial recovery for foot drop? Please explain that in your manuscript
8- Inlines, 133-137 please discuss more your result and compare it with more studies.
9- In line 139, please refer to more studies because you said studies
By revising the above, I feel that this article could be appropriate for publication in this journal and be attractive to readers.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Aug 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.

Dear editor and reviewers,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thoughtful review of the manuscript. They raise important issues and their inputs are very helpful for improving the manuscript. We agree with almost all their comments and we have revised our manuscript accordingly.

This revised version of the paper states the methodology, results and the implications of our work more clearly than before. Moreover, we are including all reviewers' suggestions and clarifying the text when needed. We are confident that the new version of the manuscript is greatly improved.

We respond below in detail to each of the reviewer's comments. In addition, we include how we have revised text, as instructed. We hope that the reviewers will find our responses to their comments satisfactory.

Please, find below the reviewers' comments in numeric order (black font) and our responses inserted after each comment (blue font). To facilitate the work of the reviewers, we refer to the manuscript indicating the line number.

Looking forward hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Furqan Mohammed Yaseen Khan, M.D
Resident of Orthopedic Surgery
Joint Reconstruction Research Center
Tehran University of Medical Sciences
Keshavarz Blvd, Tehran-1419733141, Iran
drfurqan@outlook.com

Reviewers' Comments:

Comment 1: Too many words and verbalizations have made your sentences difficult to follow, we recommend using article writing tools and Software to make shorter and more understandable phrases.

Reply: We acknowledge that our paper had few grammatical and incorrect sentences. Therefore, we have carefully revised the manuscript and made several changes in the text. We have simplified the language that is easy to follow.

Comment 2: You must explain your method for evaluating the blood loss amount, please insert your formula and your method in the manuscript.

Reply: We have explained our method of calculating intra-operative blood loss in line 86-87.

Comment 3: Please explain the analysis tests which were used in your result or method sections.

Reply: We have added further information regarding statistical analysis we performed in this study. Line 88-93.

Comment 4: In the method section, please explain and write the setting of study, is the intervention performed by single surgeon in one center?

Reply: We have added text to explain the conduction of this study. Line 65.

Comment 5: You must write about your ethical concern and your IRB approval in the method.

Reply: We have performed a retrospective study on patient database and followed on outcome. We have not made any changes to patient treatment plan or performed any further testing with respect to this study. We have not attained IRB approval as retrospective studies can be exempted.

Comment 6: What is the indications for each approach? Do you have any criteria for choosing the surgical approach? Please explain that

Reply: We have added text; explaining the indications and choice our approach. Line 95-101.

Comment 7: You say 2 patients had partial recovery, what do you mean about partial recovery for foot drop? Please explain that in your manuscript

Reply: We agree, earlier we missed to explain the method used in evaluating neurological recovery. Text is added in line 118-120.

Comment 8: In lines, 133-137 please discuss more about your result and compare with more studies.

Reply: We have elaborated the discussion, added few more studies and several text. Line 173-183.

Comment 9: - In line 139, please refer to more studies because you said studies.

Reply: Corrected. Line 141.

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) 26 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) 26 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.