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.117607
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(4); e117607

Peer Review Report for "Demographical, Anatomical, Disease-Related, and Occupational Risk Factors for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome"

Author(s): Mohaddeseh Azadvari, Mayam Haghshomar, Fatemeh Abbasi Feyjani, Hosseinali Abdolrazagh, Seyede Zahra Emami Razavi, Omid Tayebi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Jul 2021
Revised Date: 7 Oct 2021
Accepted Date: 19 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0)

22 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
The subject of the article is interesting, but some points need to be corrected or clarified in the text of the article:
1) There are many typographical errors in the text of the article. For example, the word Phalen's test is written in different ways, including fallen, which is not correct, and somewhere in the wrong form phalanx. please read the article again and correct these problems.
2) In the method part the number of patients is 113 which does not correspond to the information in the rest of the article. please correct or explain.
3) Your sample size is not clear and needs further explanation. Where are asymptomatic people selected? Who are they and with what complaint have they been referred for electrodiagnosis? Please explain
4) Since job information is not available from more than half of your patients, the results of job analysis do not seem to be very reliable.
5) And finally, since you did not find a specific relationship between your variables and the incidence of CTS (which seems to be mostly due to file defects), you cannot conclude that CTS is idiopathic and related to genetic issues. Please correct this section.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 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) 25 Sep 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.

Response to reviewer:

1)There are many typographical errors in the text of the article. For example, the word Phalen's test is written in different ways, including fallen, which is not correct, and somewhere in the wrong form phalanx. please read the article again and correct these problems.

Response:
Thank you for your helpful comment. The whole text is rechecked and changes are highlighted.

2) In the method part the number of patients is 113 which does not correspond to the information in the rest of the article. please correct or explain.

Response:
Thank you for your comment. This was a typing error and line 79 is now corrected.

3) Your sample size is not clear and needs further explanation. Where are asymptomatic people selected? Who are they and with what complaint have they been referred for electrodiagnosis? Please explain

Response:
Thank you for your comment. I'm not sure I understand what you mean and I would be very thankful if you can clarify it. There are no asymptomatic people included in this study, as mentioned on line 76 of the manuscript, we included patients with pain and paresthesia in the upper extremity that referred to Sina hospital hand clinic.

4) Since job information is not available from more than half of your patients, the results of job analysis do not seem to be very reliable.

Thank you for your comment. You are right and most of the patients we have information on, were house-keepers which will distort our results. However, when performing the analysis for job correlation with CTS we omitted the patients with no information and we still had 117 patients included in the analysis which is not a small sample. Our results are not very reliable but they are important because we are the first to find this result. This issue can be addressed in further research with specific aim to analysis job correlation with CTS.

5) And finally, since you did not find a specific relationship between your variables and the incidence of CTS (which seems to be mostly due to file defects), you cannot conclude that CTS is idiopathic and related to genetic issues. Please correct this section.

Thank you for your comment. You are right and this section is corrected. However, our sample size is large enough to make the assumption that main CTS risk factors are age and gender.

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) 18 Oct 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the answers and the explanations.
I think the article is now acceptable enough to be published.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 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) 19 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.