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.89989
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(1); e89989

Peer Review Report for "Comparison of the Economic Outcomes of Neuroaxial and General Anesthesia for Lumbar Spine Operations: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

Author(s): Zahid Hussain Khan, Ali Alemran, Abbas Alipour, Maziar Maghsoudloo, Mojgan Rahimi, Mostafa Mohammady, Asghar Hajipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Jan 2019
Revised Date:	13 Sep 2019
Accepted Date:	2 Oct 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) 21 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled:
"Comparing the economical outcome of regional and general anesthesia for lumbar spine surgery".
There are a number of issues that should be addressed:
- The English of the manuscript needs to be edited. For example:
Page 5, "inclusion/exclusion criteria: articles were included in our study …" or second line: "in adult patients".
- There are multiple phrases that should be edited.
- Method section: it is said in the manuscript: "their synonyms or acronyms were used …". The synonyms and acronyms that were used, should be precisely mentioned.
Discussion:
1- There are several paragraphs at the beginning of the section which are suitable for the 'results' section. These paragraphs just repeat the results. It is usually recommended to briefly repeat the results of the study only in the first paragraph of the discussion as the

main ideas that should be further explained in the discussion section.
2- The authors have not explained the differences or even the similarities of their results with other reports in the discussion section. If their results are different from other studies, the reasons for the differences should be explained.
Conclusion: The authors have concluded that the RA is preferred over GA for spine surgery. However, the authors have not provided the data of the complications or side effects of the anesthesia techniques they used in their study. There are also a number of limitations to this report. Therefore, I believe that the method and limitations of this study cannot support the conclusion expressing the superiority of the RA over the GA for this type of surgery because they have not evaluated all the parameters that may impact the outcome of the surgery including the side effects.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Aug 2019

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) 21 Aug 2019

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.

Replies to reviewers' comments

1. Page 5: Corrected accordingly.

2. Discussion: since the type of study is not an RCT, each single study could not be compared as it is routinely done, and meta-analysis articles addressing this subject had been very few which were mentioned in the discussion.

3. Conclusion: the comment was addressed to.

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) 28 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript has been adequately revised. It can be accepted now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 2 Oct 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 2 Oct 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.