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.83940
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(2); e83940

Peer Review Report for "Sexual Matters of Couples with Spinal Cord Injury Attending a Sexual Health Clinic in Tehran, Iran"

Author(s): Zahra Salmani, Effat Merghati Khoei, Noora Aghajani, Alireza Bayat

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Sep 2018
Revised Date: 28 Nov 2018
Accepted Date: 12 Dec 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) 31 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
The research was a cross-sectional study not a comparative study.
It would be better not to use many questionnaires (Totally 214 questions) and rather increase the number of participants in order to achieve more accuracy and raising the power of study.
There is no statistically difference in FSFI score of SCI and non SCI women. Although we have seen this situation even in infertile woman and breast cancer survivors in other studies, this finding might be related to low sample size and statistical power of study or mean age of Non SCI in comparison with SCI women.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 2 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
It is OK but it needs to be edited and be written in academic, for example in
· Abstract:
What is meant? (In other words, no significant).

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 4 Nov 2018

Dear AE,
This is a valuable search. Sexual abnormalities of SCI patients are very important & need precise attention.
The result of the abstract is incomplete.
Thee are some dictation error in tables.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Nov 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) 14 Nov 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 (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.

Response letter

We appreciated the reviewers' invaluable comments. The recommendations and inquires are responded as follow:

1. Reviewer 1:
   It is OK but it needs to be edited and be written in academic, for example in abstract:
   What is meant? (In other words, no significant). Be corrected
   We did our bests to revise the linguistic issues.
2. Reviewer 2:
   The research was a cross-sectional study not a comparative study.
   It would be better not to use many questionnaires (Totally 214 questions) and rather increase the number of participants in order to achieve more accuracy and raising the power of study.
   There is no statistically difference in FSFI score of SCI and non SCI women. Although we have seen this situation even in infertile woman and breast cancer survivors in other studies, this finding might be related to low sample size and statistical power of study or mean age of Non SCI in comparison with SCI women.
   - Although we had compared the variables between couples with either SCI-wife or SCI-husband , however the change done to the objective in page 3.
   - We do accept the reviewer's viewpoint as our study limitation, but the sample size of

$$n = \frac{(Z_{1-\alpha/2} + Z_{1-\beta})^2 (S_1^2 + S_2^2)}{(\mu_1 - \mu_2)^2}$$

   S1=10.24 M1=96.75 α= 0.05 S2=7.72 M2=86.18 B=0.2
   Regarding the above confidence interval (CI) of 95% and power of 90%, the sample size was determined to be at least 28 couples.
   Added to P1, Page8 " Small sample size can be further explanation of this finding."

3. Reviewer 3:
   This is a valuable search. Sexual abnormality of the SCI patients is very important & need precise attention. The result of the abstract is incomplete. there is some dictation error in tables.
   Result section completed as highlighted

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) — 2 Dec 2018

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 8 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The article is now acceptable by considering the applied changes.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 12 Dec 2018

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 12 Dec 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.