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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Archives of Neuroscience
Article DOI: 10.5812/ans.121425
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 9(1); e121425

Peer Review Report for "Intravenous Esmolol for Intracranial Pressure Reduction After Traumatic Brain Injury"

Author(s): Tayebeh Zarei, Arzoo Ahmadi, Atabak Najafi, Mojtaba Mojtahedzadeh, Kamal Basiri, Somayeh Mehrpour, Khalil Komlakh, Kaveh Hedayati Emami

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Nov 2021
Revised Date: 5 Feb 2022
Accepted Date: 5 Feb 2022

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) 27 Nov 2021

Dear AE,
I received the paper as a reviewer and below the authors can find my comments in detail:
- Reformat of the whole text as a case-control one instead of an RCT
Abstract
- Please change “Objective” to “Background” and mention something before the aims of the study.
- Revise “Material and methods” to “Methods”, according to journal preference structure.
- Remove the first sentence and just point to the exact final included patient.
- Remove the words such as placebo, randomly, or other words that are usually used in RCTs.
- Present some important parts of the results with their related numbers.
- Revise the conclusion as “Those patients with TBI who received Esmolol as part of their ICP control management in ICU had lower level pf ICP in comparison with those who had not received this agent.”
- Add at least 2 more proper keywords compatible with the Mesh system.

Background
- Revise “Introduction” to “Background”, according to journal preference structure.
- It is better to point to the results of the paper in which Esmolol was used in terms of ICP control in TBI patients; and if possible, controversies.
- Revise the aim of the study appropriately with a case-control study.
Methods
- Revise the whole text to make this manuscript a case-control, not an RCT. I highly recommend you to use STROBE checklist in this regard (https://www.equator-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_case-control.pdf)
- It is better to use subheadings for better presentation
- Insert ethics code.
Results
- Say all details of the final included patients; what you currently mention in the abstract is suitable to be presented hear.
- Use words instead of numbers for starting sentences if necessary.
Discussion
- Start this section with a clear and reasonable reply to the main aim of the study, which I requested to be mentioned at the end of the background.
- Insert your study limitations at the end of this part, just before the conclusion
Kind Regards

MOHAMMAD Saeidi: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Dec 2021

Dear AE,
it seems the sample size was not completely enough.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Dec 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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) 18 Dec 2021

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details 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.

Reply to reviewer

Journal: Archives of Neuroscience

Manuscript ID: 121425

Manuscript Title: Intravenous Esmolol for intracranial pressure reduction after traumatic brain injury

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Dear Authors

I received your paper as a reviewer and below you can find my comments in details:

- Reformat of the whole text as a case-control one instead of an RCT

Abstract

- Please change “Objective” to “Background” and mention something before aims of the study.

Reply: Done

- Revise “Material and methods” to “Methods”, according to journal preference structure.

Reply: Done

- Remove the first sentence and just point to the exact final included patient.

Reply: Done

- Remove the words such as placebo, randomly, or other words that usually used in RCTs.

Reply: Done

- Present some important parts of the results with their related numbers.

Reply: Done

- Revise the conclusion as “Those patients with TBI who received Esmolol as part of their ICP control management in ICU had lower level pf ICP in comparison with those who had not received this agent.”

Reply: Done

- Add at least 2 more proper keywords compatible with Mesh system.

Reply: Done

Background

- Revise “Introduction” to “Background”, according to journal preference structure.

Reply: Done

- It is better to point to the results of paper in which Esmolol was used in terms of ICP control in TBI patients; and if possible, controversies.

Reply: We made some changes in reply to your comments.

- Revise the aim of the study appropriate with a case-control study.

Reply: Done

Methods

- Revise the whole text to make this manuscript as a case-control, not a RCT. I highly recommend you to use STROB checklist in this regard (https://www.equator-network.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/STROBE_checklist_v4_case-control.pdf)

Reply: We made some changes in reply to your comments.

- It is better to use subheadings for better presentation

Reply: Done

- Insert ethics code.

Reply: Done

Results

- Say all details of final included patients; what you currently mention in abstract is suitable to be presented hear.

Reply: Done

- Use words instead of numbers for starting sentences if necessary.

Reply: Done

Discussion

- Start this section with a clear and reasonable reply to the main aim of the study, I requested to be mentioned at the end of background.

Reply: Done

- Insert your study limitations at the end of this part, just before conclusion

Reply: Done

Reviewer 2:

it seems the sample size was not completely enough

Reply: Indeed, this is a primary/pilot study that we conducted to evaluate the effect of Esmolol. We mentioned this point as our limitations

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) 5 Feb 2022

Dear AE,
I received this paper as a reviewer for its second round peer review process. In my opinion, the revisions are appropriate and I vote for acceptance.
Kind Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Feb 2022

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Feb 2022

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.