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.81492
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(1); e81492

Peer Review Report for "Investigating the Effects of Adaptive Stability Model on Headache of Patients with Migraine"

Author(s): Asma Tarjoman, Milad Borji, Saeid Safari, Masoumeh Otaghi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Jun 2018
Revised Date: 12 Sep 2018
Accepted Date: 26 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) 23 Jul 2018

Dear AE,
This article is good but needs some revision in the results, discussion, and conclusion parts. the ethical code of doing this article must add. limitation in doing this study must add and recommendation for future researches need to revise. other comments stated in the full text of the article.
With regards.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 3 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
Thank you for inviting me to review this valuable paper.
This paper reports on an important issue in Patients with Migraine, which needs more attention (especially in Iran).
Title
The title is clear, short, and according to the aims of this study.
Abstract
Abstract is complete and well designed.
Keywords

These are completely fit for study.

Background

This paper background well-structured and integrates relevant literature but it is too long.

I have some suggestion for authors:

- You can merge paragraphs 1 and 2 and make a single paragraph.
- In the introduction, it is noted that there are many non-pharmacological methods for reducing pain, but you have only mentioned a limited number. Please cite more articles.
- Please report the prevalence of migraines in the world and especially in Iran. In a separate paragraph, you can more explain about the context of the study. i.e.more explain about The prevalence of migraine in Iran and in the field of the study, methods for reducing pain and etc.
- Please explain the impact of migraines on the health status of patients, such as quality of life, mental health, and...

Methods and Materials

- More information is needed about the method including:
- It is better to write about the population of Iran and migraine percentage in the methods section.
- Please indicate why 64 patients have been selected? Please specify the reason for choosing the sample size.
- It's better to clarify the validity and reliability of your tool.
- Please clearly state the duration of the intervention and follow-up time. Your data is now a bit confused.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 8 Aug 2018

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) 8 Aug 2018

Dear Author,

Your manuscript needs minor revision.

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:

In this paper background well-structured and integrates relevant literature but it is too long. I have some suggestion for authors: You can merge paragraphs 1 and 2 and make a single paragragraph. In the introduction it is noted that there are many non-pharmacological methods for reducing pain, but you have only mentioned a limited number.

Reply Reviewers:

1. Migraine changes the health of patients, so that the problems that are caused by migraines can be reduced quality of life. The prevalence of migraine has been studied in several studies. In the study of Ebrahimi Monfared, 11.2%(17), was related to migraine, in the study of Fallahzadeh et al, 12.3% were related to tension headaches(18), in Khazaei et al, Migraine prevalence in boys 6.4% in girls and 7.6% in girls(19). (20) So according to these patients is very important(21).
2. psychological interventions(26), tailored Web-based interventions(27), Integrative Nursing Intervention(28)
3. All interventions were performed for 10 weeks.

Reviewers' Comments:

This article is good but needs some revision in the results, discussion, and conclusion parts. the ethical code of doing this article must add. limitation in doing this study must add and recommendation for future researches need to revise. other comments stated in the full text of the article.

Reply Reviewers:

1. One of the limitations of this study is the difficulty of collecting data and not collaboration with patients. To address this limitation, the benefits of this model were explained to patients and their participation was sought in a completely Optionally. One of the strengths of this study is the fact that the study used a new non-pharmacological intervention. This intervention is new and has many benefits for patients, as well as the construction of the country and is a completely natural model in accordance with the cultural conditions of Iran.

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) 31 Aug 2018

Dear AE,
Thanks for the authors' reply.
I ask them to:
- Revise references No. 13- 17 and 31.
- Write about the validity and reliability of your tool.
- It is better to write about the population of Iran and migraine percentage in the methods section.
- Please indicate why 64 patients have been selected? Please specify the reason for choosing the sample size.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Sep 2018

Dear EIC,
Still, the manuscript should be revised.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Sep 2018

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 (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.

Reviewer 1:

Dear author/s

Thanks for your reply.

Please revise references No. 13- 17 and 31.

REPLY:

13. Mortazavi-Nasiri FS, Pakdaman Sh, Dehghani M. The Association of Catastrophizing and Pain-Related Anxiety with Headache-Related Disability in Patients Suffering from Migraine. J Res Behav Sci 2015; 13(4): 609-16

17. Monfared ME, Qasami K, Ashtiani ARR, Kazemeini E. The Study of Epidemiologic, Demographic and Clinical Characteristics in Patients with Migraine Headache Referring to Neurology Clinics of Vali-Asr and Imam Reza Hospitals in Arak City. Arak Medical University Journal. 2016;19(2):1-8.

31. Esazadeh N, Radfar M, Khalkhali H. "Adaptive Ssustainability" Model: A new Approach to Rreduce Readmission in Depressed Patients. Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Urmia University of Medical Sciences. [Research]. 2016;14(5):417-25.

REPLY:

Write about the validity and reliability of your tool.

REPLY:

I Am add the article

It is better to write about the population of Iran and migraine percentage in the methods section.

REPLY:

Migraine changes the health of patients, so that the problems that are caused by migraines can be reduced quality of life. The prevalence of migraine has been studied in several studies. In the study of Ebrahimi Monfared, 11.2%(17), was related to migraine, in the study of Fallahzadeh et al, 12.3% were related to tension headaches(18), in Khazaei et al, Migraine prevalence in boys 6.4% in girls and 7.6% in girls(19). (20) So according to these patients is very important(21).

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) 17 Sep 2018

Dear AE,
All of my comments and consideration have been very good by author/s. Now I think this manuscript is ready for publishing in our journal.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 26 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) 26 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.