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.85491
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(2); e85491

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Remote Patient Monitoring on Patients with Spinal Cord Injury: A Mini-Review"

Author(s): Nafise Mazboori, Abbas Norouzi Javidan, Parisa Bahmani

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Oct 2018
Revised Date: 2 Jan 2019
Accepted Date: 23 Jan 2019

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) 28 Oct 2018

Dear AE,
Telemedicine recently become popular in different fields of medicine .the topic of the article is interesting.
There are some problems in the article that I mention below:
1. The most important problem is that the article doesn't have the result part. We can't understand which articles included in the study. Usually, review articles summarize the result of the articles in tables that the present study doesn't have.
2. The writing style of introduction writing style is not scientific enough.the terms which the author used weren't specific in the field of spinal cord injury.
3. The discussion part is mostly a repetition of the Introduction.
4. There are some Grammatical points in the article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Nov 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)

21 Nov 2018

Dear Author,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed.

According to the comments, the document needs major 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.

Telemedicine recently become popular in different field of medicine .the topic of the article is interesting. There are some problems in the article that I mention below:

1. The most important problem is that the article doesn't have result part .We can't understand which articles included the study. Usually review articles summarize the result of the articles in tables that the present study doesn't have. The result part and table added.

2. The writing style of introduction writing style is not scientific enough. the terms which author used weren't specific in the field of spinal cord injury. Corrected

3. The discussion part is mostly repetition of Introduction. Corrected

4. There are some Grammatical points in the article. Corrected

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 Jan 2019

Dear AE,
Nearly most of the points corrected in the text.
In the last line of the first paragraph of the result part, the author mentioned NMES-RT, what RT stands for. Please add the meaning in the text.
Sincerely yours.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 23 Jan 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 23 Jan 2019

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