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.79504
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(1); e79504

Peer Review Report for "Serum Homocysteine Level and Lipid Profile in Migraine Patients Treated with Sodium Valproate"

Author(s): Shirin Shakiba, Majid Ghafarpour, Payam Sarraf, Sakineh Ranji-Burachaloo, Ali Shakiba, Abbas Tafakhori

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 21 May 2018
Revised Date: 16 Aug 2018
Accepted Date: 8 Sep 2018

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) — 26 May 2018

Dear AE,
The article is written well and the results are valuable.
Two general comments:
1. please edit the background part of the abstract.
2. the non-parametric test for paired sample t-test is a sign or Wilcoxon test, not Mann Whitney.
Best

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Jun 2018

Dear AE,
I read an interesting article. it was written well.
In my opinion, it is acceptable.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 27 Jun 2018

Dear AE,

This is an interesting work but some changes are needed.

1) In the Introdution the Authors claim that “there is still no study on the effect of sodium valproate on the lipid profile in migraine patients”. But in the literature there is at least one article on this topic (Green and Coll. Effect of Divalproex on metabolic parameters is dose-related in migraine prophylaxis. Headache 45 (8),1031-1037,2005). Moreover,in this study the Authors found reduction in serum cholesterol and this different result should be discussed.

2) The Authors examined 52 patients with migraine: with or without aura? This may have some importance because some Authors found higher levels of homocysteine in migraine with aura, so the levels of homocysteine should be referred separately.

3) Information about the frequency, duration and intensity of the migraine before and after the therapy are needed.

4) In the Table I refer the Standard Deviation.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 4 Jul 2018

Dear Author,

The manuscript should be revised based on 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 in chief,

Enclosed please find the revised version of Manuscript " 79504" entitled " **Serum homocysteine level and lipid profile in migraine patients treated with sodium valproate**" that we are resubmitting to Archives of Neuroscience . Thank you for reviewing our paper. We have incorporated the suggested change. A new version of the paper is included. We also confirm that the manuscript has been approved by all co-authors.

We have made the following correction:

Reviewer 2 had Two general comments:
1. please edit the background part of the abstract.

Background part of the abstract was edited.

2. the non-parametric test for paired sample t-test is sign or wilcoxon test not Mann whiteny.

It was changed

Reviewer 3 had 4 comments:

1) In the Introdution the Authors claim that "there is still no study on the effect of sodium valproate on the lipid profile in migraine patients". But in the literature there is at least one article on this topic (Green and Coll. Effect of Divalproex on metabolic parameters is dose related in migraine prophylaxis. Headache 45(8),1031-1037,2005).

We changed "introduction" and "discussion" sections:
"These conflicting results were established in epileptic patients and based on our knowledge there is very little data available about the effects of sodium valproate in serum homocysteine level and lipid profile in migraine patients [10]."

2) The Authors examined 52 patients with migraine: with or without aura? This may have some importance because some Authors found higher levels of homocysteine in migraine with aura, so the levels of homocysteine should be referred separately.

We corrected this part:
" This study included 52 adult patients with aura free migraine"

3) Information about the frequency, duration and intensity of the migraine before and after the therapy are needed.

We added this information in methods and results sections:

" Characteristics of migraine attacks including frequency of attacks in month and duration of each attack in hours were collected at baseline and at the end of the study."

" Frequency of migraine attacks decreased during treatment period significantly (7.5±2.8 times in month at baseline compared with 4.2±2.4 at the end of study P = 0.001). Sodium valproate reduced duration of migraine attacks, significantly (12.1 ±8.3 hours compared with 6.6 ± 3.6; P = 0.000). "

4) In the Table I refer the Standard Deviation.

Standard Deviations were added to table 1.

As you kindly see, we have addressed all the comments of the esteemed reviewer as best we could. Thank you in advance for your consideration and timely re-review of this manuscript.

Sincerely Yours,

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) 8 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
In the Discussion, the Authors refer: " Green et al and Eiris et al reported a significant decrease in serum total cholesterol, HDL and LDL levels in patients with seizures during treatment with sodium valproate". But Green et al reported the effects of sodium valproate in migraine patients and NOT in epileptic patients.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Aug 2018

Dear EIC,
The author should correct the section that reviewer wanted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Aug 2018

Dear Author,
Please correct the mentioned parts based on the reviewers' comments.
Thanks

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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 in chief,

Enclosed please find the revised version of Manuscript " 79504" entitled " **Serum homocysteine level and lipid profile in migraine patients treated with sodium valproate**" that we are resubmitting to Archives of Neuroscience . Thank you for reviewing our paper. We have incorporated the suggested change. A new version of the paper is included. We also confirm that the manuscript has been approved by all co-authors.

We have made the following correction:

Reviewer 1 had a minor comment:

In the Discussion the Authors refer: " Green et al and Eiris et al reported a significant decrease in serum total cholesterol, HDL and LDL levels in patients with seizures during treatment with sodium valproate". But Green et al reported the effects of sodium valproate in migraine patients and NOT in epileptic patients.

It was changed

As you kindly see, we have addressed all the comments of the esteemed reviewer as best we could. Thank you in advance for your consideration and timely re-review of this manuscript.

Sincerely Yours,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 5 Sep 2018

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 8 Sep 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 8 Sep 2018

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