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.106239
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(3); e106239

Peer Review Report for "Gender and Age Difference in Clinical Features and severity of Parkinson's Disease: A Cross-Sectional Study in Southern Morocco"

Author(s): Abderrahmane Achbani, Sofiane Ait Wahmane , Mohamed Elatiqi, Hasnaa Sine, Ahmed Kharbach, Ahmed Belmouden, Mohamed Nejmeddine

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Jun 2020
Revised Date:	24 Jun 2020
Accepted Date:	28 Jun 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) 16 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The current study is an interesting attempt to determine the characteristics of PD patients in the southern region of Morocco. The authors performed a cross-sectional analysis and showed for the first time that the onset of the
disease was earlier in female compared to male groups. In addition, that the prevalence of rigidity symptoms was slightly higher in younger patients and in patients. Importantly, this study demonstrated that the initial
symptom of male patients differs from that of females. Unfortunately, we do not have enough data about PD in the MENA region and I think that this paper is of great interest to the scientific and clinical community. The data analysis and data presentation are correct and well done, However, the language of the manuscript needs to be improved.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The present manuscript brings important data regarding the Parkinson's disease in the Southern of Morocco.
However, to complete the manuscript, Authors should clarify some points:
- The study was done in Agadir, why authors didn't take the recommandation of the ethics committees of the Faculty of Medecine and Pharmacy in Agadir, why Marrakech?
- Line 7: Parkinson's disease (PD) is the second two most frequently reported neurodegenerative diseases. Diseases without S.
- Line8: Especially in reions south of country. Authors sould replace this sentence by especially in South regions of the coutry for exxample.
- Line 34: It is estimated at about 66-1500 for every 100 000. what's the unit? for every 100 000 what?
- Line 47: Increasing by 37.9% since 1990 (12). The prevalence of PD. Ahthors have to change the full stop by comma.
- Line 63: All data were collected during the period starting in January 2017 until July 2018. Authors should change in...until to from...until.
- Line 108: In contrast, they present with less bradykinesia (15(23.8%)). The sentence is not clear and (15(23.8%)) also.
- Line 149: PD started earlier in female compare to male population, 58.3 ± 10.4 . What's the unit of the mean?
- In the figure 1 and 2, I didn't see the statistical difference between groups, where's the p value??
- In the reference part:
Authors must arrange the work in chronological or in alphabetical order.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 20 Jun 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) 20 Jun 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 in chief

Please find enclosed our responses to the various reviewers' comments on the manuscript entitled Gender and Age Difference in Clinical Features and severity of Parkinson's Disease: A Cross-Sectional Study in Southern Morocco.

Reviewers' comments (one-by-one)

comments	replies
Reviewer 1	
1. The study was done in Agadir, why authors didn't take the recommandation of the ethics committees of the faculty f Medecine and Pharmacy in Agadir, why Marrakech?	1. The ethics committee at the Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy in Agadir has not yet been instituted.
2. Line 7: Parkinson's disease (PD) is the second two most frequently reported neurodegenerative diseases. Diseases without S.	2. I deleted "s" (neurodegenerative disease~~s~~)
3. Line8: Especially in regions south of country. Authors should replace this sentence by especially in South regions of the coutry for exxample.	3. I replaced " regions south of country " with South regions of the country
4. Line 34: It is estimated at about 66-1500 for every 100 000. what's the unit? for every 100 000 what?	4. I added the unit (66-1500 cases for every 100,000 population).
5. Line 47: Increasing by 37.9% since 1990 (12). The prevalence of PD. Ahthors have to change the full stop by comma.	5. we changed the point to a comma. (Increasing by 37.9% since 1990 (12),the prevalence of PD)
6. Line 63: All data were collected during the period starting in January 2017 until July 2018. Authors should change in...until to from...until.	6. we have replaced "in" with until to from (All data were collected during the period starting until to from January 2017 until July 2018).
7. Line 108: In contrast, they present with less bradykinesia (15(23.8%)). The sentence is not clear and (15(23.8%)) also.	7. i.e. by comparing women and men, we notice that women have less bradykinesia than men (only 15 out of 63 women with bradykinesia).
8. Line 149: PD started earlier in female compare to male population, 58.3 ± 10.4. What's the unit of the mean?	8. we added "years" 58.3 ± 10.4 years
9. In the figure 1 and 2, I didn't see the statistical difference between groups, where's the p value??	9. I added the p value on the graph.
10. In the reference part:	10. In the bibliographical references, I used the style requested by the

Authors must arrange the work in chronological or in alphabetical order.	journal (Vancouver- kowsar 2018).
Reviewer2	
11. the language of the manuscript needs to be improved.	**11.**the article has been revised by an English language teacher.

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) 27 Jun 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) 28 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 Jun 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.