**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.90159
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(3); e90159

# Peer Review Report for "Effect of Basic Characteristics on Improving Quality of Life After Lumbar Spine Decompression Surgery"

**Author(s):** Arezoo Chouhdari, Omidvar Rezaei, Parinaz Rezapour, Mohammad Samadian, Hadi Shahrabi Farahani, Mohammadreza Hajiesmaeili, Kaveh Ebrahimzadeh

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 2 Feb 2019
Revised Date: 11 May 2019
Accepted Date: 15 May 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) — 6 Mar 2019

Dear AE,
In my opinion author should make some changes in the method section.They should divide patients in two groups: first decompression with fusion & second decompression without fusion.Then all of the test should done on the both separate groups .Because we can not merge both group in analysis due to different situation that they have.
The second point is that the author should mention the exact pathology of the patient(diagnosis) & the exact level(s) that they decompressed. Now we don't have any data about MRI & surgical process that have done on the patients.
Sincerely yours.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 9 Apr 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major 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)

9 Apr 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.

**Dear Reviewers,**

Thanks a lot for valuable comments.

1- This type of study has not been carried out in Iran until now. So the goal in current survey was determining the factors affecting on the quality of life in the patients before- after the lumbar decompression surgery and the type of surgery (decompression with or without fusion) is also considered as an effective item (separate variable). But we did not divide the patients in two groups based on kind of surgery, because the main aim was not investigating surgical type effect on the quality of life. The idea of this study was taken from K.A.Jansson study From the Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.
2- According to the variables studied and mentioned in the method, focus was on the underlying variables include demographic characteristics (age, sex, educational level, life model, smoking, past medical history, duration of pain before surgery) , signs and symptoms of patients [leg and back pain scale, regular activity, walking ability (meter) and pathology of diagnosis was not studied. These items will be studied in another project.

Sincerely,

**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) 8 May 2019

Dear AE,
According to the authors response ,I think that they should change their topic to the"socioeconomic & epidemiological factor on improving the quality of life after lumbar spine decompression surgery.
Is better to add my previous comments on limitation art of their article,because using instrument & fusion is important factor that may influence quality of life of a person.
Thanks,

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 8 May 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** (1) 8 May 2019

Dear Author,
The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.
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.

**Dear Reviewers**

.Thank you for your comments

***Question**:* according to the authors response, I think that they should change their topic to the "socioeconomic & epidemiological factor on improving the quality of life after lumbar spine .decompression surgery

***Answer:*** In this survey we investigated basic characteristics of patients in improvement of quality of life after surgery and there was not focus on socioeconomic and epidemiologic .items. For example, we had no economic factor in this study

:Because this title is not suitable in the opinion of reviewers, we change the title as follows

**" Effect of basic characteristics on improving quality of life after lumbar spine decompression surgery"**

**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) 13 May 2019

Dear AE,
Changing the title is acceptable.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 May 2019

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

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 May 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.