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.89993
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(3); e89993

Peer Review Report for "Mortality Related to Intubation in Adult General ICUs: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis"

Author(s): Zahid Hussain Khan, Mohammed AbdulZahra Sasaa, Mostafa Mohammadi, Abbas Alipour, Asghar Hajipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	23 Oct 2019
Revised Date:	5 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	2 May 2020

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) — 13 Dec 2019

Dear AE,

1. This manuscript has a major defect. The patient who needs intubation also has an underlying condition that can be the leading cause of patient death; Unfortunately, this manuscript didn't pay attention to it. Therefore can mortality be attributed to intubation only?
2. Improve the English grammar of text.
3. Observe the systematic review requirements of the journal.

Thanks.

Mojgan Rahimi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 16 Dec 2019

Dear AE,

There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:

1) English language in this article should be revised.

2) In data extraction 27 articles have been included but in flow diagram 28 articles have

been included!!

3) In the discussion the different causes of mortality due to intubation has been discussed so it is advisable to change the title of the article to the rate and causes of mortality due to tracheal intubation in adult general ICU.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Dec 2019

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) 18 Dec 2019

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major 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.

.Thank you very much to give us opportunity to revise our article and we are happy for that

:Reviewer1

.1 Intubation in intensive care unit can be lifesaving or life threating, also death can occur underlying condition of patient in general ICUs. But based on literatures intubation related mortality define as a death during intubation procedure or within 60 minutes after intubation and we consider this period of time as a intubation related mortality, (correlation mortality), and overall ICU mortality define as mortality related intubation .during admission and stay in ICU general

.2 English grammar revised by native speaker

.3 We follow the journal requirements for systematic review research

:Reviewer2

.1 English language revised by native speaker

.2 in the data extraction is writing mistake (27)

.3 Absolutely there are different causes of death related mortality in ICU, its correlation mortality not causation and we cannot change the title because our search strategies .depend on the title words

Best regard

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) — 30 Apr 2020

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) — 2 May 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 May 2020

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