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.93103
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(3); e93103

Peer Review Report for "Suppression of Menstrual-Related Migraine Attack Severity Using Pyridoxine, Thiamine, and Cyanocobalamin: A Quasi-Experimental Within-Subject Design"

Author(s): Mansoureh Togha, Reza Rahmanzadeh, Shiva Nematgorgani, Zahra Yari, Soodeh Razeghi Jahromi, Farshid Refaeian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 Jun 2019
Revised Date: 9 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 4 Mar 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) — 2 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
In the absence of a control group, in the "Study strengths and limitations" should be noted the possible placebo effect of intramuscular therapy.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 24 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I have read the paper of Togha et al. with attention, this is acceptable in terms of innovation. They assessed the efficacy and tolerability of a combination of vitamins B1, B6, and B12 (Neurobion) for prophylaxis of menstruation related migraine attacks in a quasi-experimental study. They reported that neurotropic vitamins may result in significant reductions in menstrual related migraine attacks' severity. The sample size and study design are acceptable. In order to improve the paper, it is recommended to consider the points mentioned.

1. Few typos and grammatical errors.
2. It is better to mention the dose of Neurobion component in the abstract.
3. Had oral administration of group B vitamins or multivitamin supplements contraindicated during the intervention? This is not mentioned in the method.
4. Flow diagram of the study participants is strongly recommended.
5. Patient compliance should be reported. Also, the number of patients excluded from the study and the causes should be indicated, in the result and flowchart.
6. Didn't patients report any complications during the study? Please mention.
7. Add a significant symbol to figure 1.
8. Spell out "Figure", do not use Fig.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 25 Sep 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) 25 Sep 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.

We are very grateful for thoughtful comments and recommendations provided by the Reviewer of this manuscript. We wish to express our appreciation to the reviewer for insightful comments. We have carefully addressed the reviewer suggestions and in doing so feel the manuscript is substantially strengthened. We have addressed the reviewer specific concerns as follows:

Reviewer 1:

I've read the paper of Togha et al. with attention, this is acceptable in terms of innovation. They assessed the efficacy and tolerability of a combination of vitamins B1, B6 and B12 (Neurobion) for prophylaxis of menstruation related migraine attacks in a quasi-experimental study. They reported that neurotropic vitamins may result in significant reductions in menstrual related migraine attacks' severity. The sample size and study design are acceptable. In order to improve the paper, it is recommended to consider the points mentioned.

1. Few typos and grammatical errors.

Thanks for your comment; a native-English speaking scientific colleague has edited the manuscript.

2. It is better to mention to the dose of Neurobion component in the abstract.

Thanks for your comment; It is revised accordingly. We added: each ampoule, containing 100 mg of vitamin B1 and B6 and 1000 µg of vitamin B12

3. Had oral administration of group B vitamins or multivitamin supplements contraindicated during the intervention? This is not mentioned in the method.

Thanks for your comment, we added: Patients already taking group B vitamins or multivitamin supplements, were excluded as well.

4. Flow diagram of the study participants is strongly recommended

We strongly appreciate the reviewer's comment on this point. Flow diagram was inserted.

5. Patient compliance should be reported. Also, the number of patients excluded from the study and the causes should be indicated, in the result and flowchart

We thank the reviewer for detailed consideration. We added a short statement in the result and study flow chart.

6. Didn't patients report any complications during the study? Please mention

Thanks for your comment; We added: No side effects have been reported.

7. Add significant symbol to figure 1

In accordance with your comment, we added.

8. Spell out "Figure", do not use Fig.

Thanks for your comment, we changed it.

Reviewer 2:

In the absence of a control group, in the "Study strengths and limitations" should be noted the possible placebo effect of the intramuscular therapy.

We thank the reviewer for detailed consideration. We added a short statement as follow: Another significant limitation of this study is that no sham group was studied.

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) 12 Feb 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) 4 Mar 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 4 Mar 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.