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.92611
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 6(3); e92611

Peer Review Report for "The Validity and Reliability of a Persian Version of the Brief Community Screening Instrument for Dementia in the Elderly Patients with Dementia in Iran"

Author(s): Mohsen Davoudkhani, Reza Kormi-Nouri, Abbas Norouzi Javidan, Farshad Sharifi, Farnaz Younesi, Azadeh Sadat Zendehbad, Maryam Noroozian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 28 Jun 2019
Accepted Date: 12 Jul 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) — 30 May 2019

Dear AE,
- This appreciable article is reviewed in cross-sectional study reviewer guidelines.
- Title shows the aim of study
- Abstract was informative and in good style.
- The introduction appropriately explains the scientific background for the study.
- The method of study describes the setting, location and data collection process.
- Study size and statistical method are acceptable.
- In conclusion, the sentence " Thus, it is necessary to diagnose the MCI cases better in low educated people" would be changed in appropriate style.

After this minor revision, this article will be accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 19 Jun 2019

Dear AE,

This is a well-written manuscript entitled "The validity and reliability of a Persian version of The brief community screening instrument for dementia (CSI-D) in the elderly patients with dementia in Iran" that is advantageous and mandatory for everyone who works in the dementia field.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 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) 19 Jun 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.

The replies to dear reviewers

Dear Reviewer 1:

Thank you for your kind comments. I appreciate your time.

Dear Reviewer 2:

Thank you for your kind comments. I really appreciate your time. The revised the sentence you mentioned in this way:

Conclusion:

Early detection is an important factor to decrease the prevalence of dementia. In this context, diagnosis at MCI level is very important (11). Studies show correlation between illiteracy and dementia (4). Because memory loss is considered as a normal aging phenomenon, MCI diagnosis is of great importance among low educated people (11). However, it is hard because there is not a suitable test. The brief CSI-D is a favorable tool for screening dementia in community level. This study showed that The Persian version of brief CSI-D can detect MCI which is an advantage in dementia screening among illiterate and low educated population.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 12 Jul 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 Jul 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.