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.111362
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(2); e111362

Peer Review Report for "Cerebral Amyloid Angiopathy with Cortical Subarachnoid Hemorrhage as a Mimic for Transient Ischemic Attack: A Case Report"

Author(s): Mazyar Hashemilar, Nasrin Forghani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 8 May 2021
Accepted Date: 15 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) 26 Nov 2020

Dear AE,
I received the paper as a reviewer. In my opinion, it is a well-presented case including proper imaging. There is only one point I want the authors to include. How did they make the diagnosis of CAA in this case? As they know, it is a diagnostic that just could confirm after death via tissue biopsy; but there is also a criterion in this regard. I suggest they mention this important point at the beginning of the discussion part.
Kind regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 29 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
This case report is well written. To improve more I suggest the authors considering the following items:
1- Please mention the other causes of convexity SAH in the discussion to be more informative.
2- Blooming artifact in the SWI photo is tiny and I recommend replacing other photoss or

magnify the picture with more resolution.
3- Please notify the changes in photos with arrows.
Best wishes

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 3 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision. The authors should revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 May 2021

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 Dr. Zahid Hussain Khan, Editor-in-Chief of Archives of Neuroscience

Thank you for sending me valuable comments of the reviewers for our manuscript to the journal. Our answers to the reviewers' comments are as below:

Reviewer 1:

1. To fulfill the respected reviewer's comment concerning the diagnosis of CAA without tissue biopsy, three additional sentences were added to the discussion section of the revised manuscript. All newly added sentences were highlighted in yellow color in the revised manuscript word file submitted.

Reviewer 2:

1. To fulfill the respected reviewer's comment concerning the mentioning of the other causes of convexity SAH in discussion, I edited the related part. Three new sentences were added in the discussion section for the related topic instead of the previous sentence ("The etiology of cSAH differs by age…"). The previous older related reference was replaced with the newly updated reference with the same reference number (6) in the revised manuscript. All newly added sentences and the new reference were highlighted in yellow color in the revised manuscript word file submitted.

2. To fulfill the respected reviewer's comment concerning the tiny blooming artifact in SWI photo, figure 2 was replaced with the new photo with more resolution and details.

3. To fulfill the respected reviewer's comment concerning the notifying the changes in photos with arrows, I added arrows pointing the related imaging findings in newly submitted figures 1, 2 and 3.

Best regards,

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 13 May 2021

Dear AE,
The revisions are acceptable.
Good luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 15 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) 15 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.