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.115878
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(4); e115878

Peer Review Report for "Does Caffeine Consumption Affect the Symptoms of Parkinson's Disease? A Systematic Review of Clinical Trials"

Author(s): Anita Reyhanifard , Sarvin Sanaie, Mojgan Mirghafurvand, Sama Rahnemayan, Arezoo Fathalizadeh, Ata Mahmoodpoor, Elnaz Faramarzi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	4 May 2021
Revised Date:	15 Aug 2021
Accepted Date:	18 Oct 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Abderrahmane Achbani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Relevant topic, which tried to gather all the studies that dealt with the role of caffeine in the evolution of the symptoms of Parkinson's disease.
- The research protocol for systematic reviews is respected (Prisma guide).
- He used questionnaires to assess the risk of bias in different studies.
- The manuscript is good in writing and methodology and is suitable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 24 Jul 2021

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)** 24 Jul 2021

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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 your email. The manuscript has been revised according to reviewer comments. The changes have been highlighted with yellow color.

Tables

Table(s) should be drawn by the table tools of Microsoft office Word. Please, draw the table(s).

-All tables were drawn by Microsoft office words. Therefore, all borders were not removed.

A brief title should be written for each Table.

-Title of table was written briefly.

- Figures

A brief title should be written for each Figure.

-Title of figures has been written briefly.

The Figures should be uploaded as separate files in the journal website

All figures have been uploaded.

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) 18 Oct 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 18 Oct 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.