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.112867
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(1); e112867

Peer Review Report for "Attitude and Knowledge of Patients with Multiple Sclerosis (MS) About COVID-19 as Provided by Physicians"

Author(s): Mahsa Ghajarzadeh, Abdorreza Naser Moghadasi, Samira Navardi, Aida Mohammadi, Sara Hamtaee, Mohammad Ali Sahraian, Sreeram V Ramagopalan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	11 Jan 2021
Revised Date:	27 Feb 2021
Accepted Date:	2 Mar 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) — 24 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Paying attention to these patients in the covid 19 pandemics is an important issue.
This article is suitable for publication.
Thanks indeed.

omid mirmosayyeb: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 6 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
I reviewed the manuscript entitled "Attitude and knowledge regarding COVID-19 and the amount of knowledge the patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) got from physicians"
It is a well-written manuscript which is studied important aspects of MS patients regarding COVID-19. However, there are some highlights which should be addressed by the authors prior to possible publication.
1- It is better to add more appropriate keywords for the manuscript. (based on MESH terms)
2- There are a few related manuscripts that are better to be addressed and discussed in the discussion.
3- Since there are few related reports, the first paragraph of the discussion needs to be

changed.

4- It is better to mention more details about the procedure of the study. How was the patient selection based on definite criteria? (since goggle forms were sent to patients)

5- There are some abbreviations that should be mentioned in expanded form, especially in tables. Also, generic names of medicines should be written.

6- It is better to mention more details about questionnaires and checklists in the method.

7- It is better to mention the limitations and strengths of the study at the end of the discussion.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 6 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,

The manuscript needs minor revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 6 Feb 2021

Dear Author,

Please revise the manuscript based on the reviewers' comments.

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,

Thanks for reviewing my manuscript. Below you can find the responses.

Reviewer 1:
Dear Editor in chief,
Paying attention to these patients in covid 19 pandemic is an important issue.
This article is suitable for publication.
***Thanks indeed**.*
Reviewer 2:
I reviewed the manuscript entitled "Attitude and knowledge regarding COVID-19 and the amount of knowledge the patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) got from physicians"
It is a well-written manuscript which is studied important aspects of MS patients regarding COVID-19.
However, there are some highlights which should be addressed prior to possible publication.
1- It is better to add more appropriate keywords for the manuscript. (based on MESH terms)

The new keywords are added.
2- There are few related manuscripts that are better to be addressed and discussed in the discussion.

New findings of recent articles are added.
3- Since there are few related reports, the first paragraph of the discussion needs to be changed.

It is changed.
4- It is better to mention more details about the procedure of the study. How was the patient selection based on definite criteria? (since goggle forms were sent to patients).

They are all mentioned in the method.
5- There are some abbreviations that should be mentioned in expanded form, especially in tables. Also, generic names of medicines should be written.

They are added.
6- It is better to mention more details about questionnaires and checklists in the method.

***They are added**.*
7- It is better to mention the limitations and strengths of the study at the end of the discussion.

***They are added**.*

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 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
All of the comments have been addressed in the manuscript and it is prepared for possible publication.
Good luck

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 2 Mar 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 Mar 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.