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.118744
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 8(4); e118744

Peer Review Report for "Challenges of Patients with Spinal Cord Injury During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Qualitative Study"

Author(s): Masoud Hatefi, Milad Borji, Yousef Jamshidbeigi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 16 Aug 2021
Revised Date: 25 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 15 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) 24 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for this good and practical article.
The authors should note the following points:
- Prevalence and incidence of SCIs in the country of conducted study is not stated.
- Introduction section, second paragraph, first and second sentences reference is not mentioned.
- Inclusion criteria are not clear if participants have experienced Covid-19 or not?
- The researchers have not discussed how they decided to use the selected method.
- It is not mentioned that if the researchers critically examined their own role, potential bias, and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation.
- Please edit this sentence in the discussion section “this is the first qualitative study on the challenges of patients with SCIs during the Covid-19 pandemic”. What is your mean? The first study in where? In the world or in the country of conducted study?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 15 Sep 2021

Dear AE,

I received the submission as a reviewer. Qualitative researches have a specific field that it is always possible to perform better than the one conducted, while the current one is still correct. I have no reason not to accept this paper and in my opinion, the paper is suitable for publication.
Kind regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 16 Sep 2021

Dear AE,
Good article and new topic. The following comments are suggested to the authors to modify the article:
1- Please mention the ethics criteria in the research.
2- Please mention the sample volume reference.
3- Part 3.3.1. Demographic Characteristic needs correction.
4- Add demographic characteristics.
5- The questions asked of the patients in the interview should be added in the method section.
6- The method of data analysis should be written in a more complete way and it should be referenced.
Good luck.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 17 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) 17 Sep 2021

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

Reviewer 1:

1- Please mention the ethics criteria in the research.

Reply:

This is a qualitative study that was performed on SCI patients after obtaining the code of ethics from the Research Ethics Committee of Ilam University of Medical Sciences (IR.MEDILAM.REC.1400.083) in 2021.

2- Please mention the sample volume reference.

Reply:

I added

3- Part 3.3.1. Demographic Characteristic needs correction.

Reply:

After the interviewee's basic acquaintance with the objectives of the research and the conditions of the interviews, the researchers started interviews by asking questions such as "What were the limitations you had during Covid-19 illness?", "What problems did you have during Covid-19 illness?" "What was the difference between the physical care needs you had at the time of Covid-19 and pre-pandemic phase?", " What was the difference between the psychological needs you had at the time of Covid-19 and pre-pandemic phase? "," What have you been worried about since Covid-19 disease? "," How is the amount and type of care provided by your caregivers different from the pre-Covid-19 period? " How has the spread of Covid-19 disease affected your health care? ".

4- Add demographic characteristics.

Reply:

The form of demographic characteristics included questions about the history of spinal cord injury, age, sex (female, male), education (illiterate, diploma and undergraduate, university), marriage (married, unmarried).

Reply:

The Mean (Standard deviation) age and history of SCI of participants of the present study was 54.2(9.8), 12.8(4.9) years. A total of 32% of participants were female and 68% were male. In terms of education, 57% of patients were illiterate, 38% had a diploma and 5% had a university degree. Also 68% of patients had a spouse and 32% had no spouse.

5. The questions asked of the patients in the interview should be added in the method section.

Reply:

I add in the article.

6- The method of data analysis should be written in a more complete way and it should be referenced.

Reply:

Quantitative variables in the study were analyzed using spss16 software and descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics were used to differentiate between intervention groups.

Reviewer 2:

- Prevalence and incidence of SCIs in the country of conducted study is not stated.

Reply:

No evidence is available.

- Introduction section, second paragraph, first and second sentences reference is not mentioned.

Reply:

In addition to their physical problems, SCIs affect the mental and emotional functioning of the patient and their family. In the meta-analysis study on 41 articles, Aaby showed that these patients had low level of life satisfaction and quality of life and high rate of anxiety, stress and post-traumatic stress disorder. Other studies have also shown that this disease can lead to disruptions in employment, friendships and family relationships that ultimately reduce a person's participation in society (6-8). Also, in the meta-analysis study of 25 articles, Wei et al. showed that these patients had venous thromboembolism (9). Moreover, in another meta-analysis study, in which 37 articles entered the meta-analysis phase, Hunt et al. showed that the prevalence of post-SCI pain was 68%.

- Inclusion criteria are not clear if participants have experienced Covid-19 or not?

Reply:

Whether or not patients with spinal cord injury had Covid-19 had no effect on our study.

- The researchers have not discussed how they decided to use the selected method.

Reply:

The researchers enrolled patients with SCI by available sampling method.

- It is not mentioned that if the researchers critically examined their own role, potential bias, and influence during analysis and selection of data for presentation

Reply:

Two researchers analyzed the data. In case of any differences between individuals, data analysis was performed by a third party.

- Please edit this sentence in the discussion section "this is the first qualitative study on the challenges of patients with SCIs during the Covid-19 pandemic". What is your mean? The first study in where? In the world or in the country of conducted study?

Reply:

This is the first qualitative study on the challenges of patients with SCIs during Covid-19 pandemic in Iran.

Reviewer 3:

Dear Authors

I received your submission as a reviewer. Qualitative researches have specific field that it is always possible to perform better than the one conducted, while the current one still corrects. I have no reason to not accept this paper and in my opinion the paper is suitable for publication.

Reply:

Thank you very much for your comments. thanks a lot. Kind regards

.

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) 29 Sep 2021

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) 15 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) 15 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.