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.81059
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 5(4); e81059

Peer Review Report for "Anesthetic Management of T12 Schwannoma in a Patient with Churg-Strauss Syndrome: A Case Report"

Author(s): Zahid Hussain Khan, Masoud Nashibi, Ardeshir Tajbakhsh, Zahid Hussain Khan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Jun 2018
Revised Date: 21 Jul 2018
Accepted Date: 15 Aug 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)

6 Jul 2018

Dear AE,
Comments to Editor:
Title
• good
Abstract
• good
Keyword
• good
Introduction
• Authors just should express better in the last paragraph that “What does report add to the medical literature?”
Case presentation
• good
Discussion
• good
References
• Where available, PMID and DOI for the references must be provided.

Overall:

• The authors have done a pretty good job.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 11 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,

The authors should revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.

Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 11 Jul 2018

Dear Author,

Please revise the manuscript 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.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
MANUSCRIPT REVIEW FORM
Manuscript ID: 81059
Manuscript Full Title:
Anesthetic Management of T12 Schwannoma for a patient with Churg-Strauss Syndrome: A Case Report
Technical correctness: Good
Novelty/originality: Good
RECOMMENDATION: Acceptance with just minor revision

Comments to Editor:

Title
• good
Abstract
• good
Keyword
• good
Introduction
• Authors just should express better in the last paragraph that "What dose report add to the medical literature?"

A paragraph has been added in the introduction section.
Case presentation
• good
Discussion
• good

References
• Where available, PMID and DOI for the references must be provided.

PMID and DOI are not available.

Overall:
• The authors have done a pretty good job.

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) 11 Aug 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** (1) 15 Aug 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 15 Aug 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.