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.96490
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(3); e96490

Peer Review Report for "A Review of Bispectral Index Utility in Neurocritical Care Patients"

Author(s): Hossein Yousefi-Banaem, Reza Goharani, Mohammadreza Hajiesmaeili, Arash Tafrishinejad, Masoud Zangi, Mahdi Amirdosara, Masoud Nashibi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 16 May 2020
Accepted Date: 28 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) — 19 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The article was interesting but the following notes must be corrected:
1. The first abbreviations both in the abstract and in the text must be fully explained in parentheses.
2. The term "neurocritical" is incorrectly cited in some places such as abstract and must be corrected everywhere.
3. It is better to use barbiturate coma instead of phenobarbital coma.
4.The date of the first introduction of BIS in the abstract and the text does not match.
5. It is mentioned in the text sedation agitation scale and ramsay sedation scale, so it is better to explain them.
6. References should be written based on Vancouver style and the names of the journals should be summarized.
7. Because this article is a review article, please review the terms of the archives of neuroscience journals for review articles and apply them.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 23 Oct 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) 23 Oct 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 Reviewer

Thank you for our paper consideration. We have done your valuable comments and also we revised the paper totally. The paper revised basically and totally changed so all text is highlighted.

Reviewer 1:
The article was interesting but the following notes must be corrected:
1.The first abbreviations both in the abstract and in the text must be fully explained in parentheses.

Done
2.The term "neurocritical" is incorrectly cited in some places such as abstract and must be corrected everywhere.

Done
3.It is better to use barbiturate coma instead of phenobarbital coma.

Done
4.The date of the first introduction of BIS in the abstract and the text does not match.

Done
5.it is mentioned in the text sedation agitation scale and ramsay sedation scale, so it is better to explain them.

Done
6. References should be written based on Vancouver style and the names of the journals should be summarized.

Done
7.Because this article is a review article ,please review the terms of the archives of neuroscience journal for review articles and apply them.

Done

Shirvani M, Delam H, Karimizade M. Brain Infection After Cesarean Section: A Case of Subdural Empyema Post-Cesarean Section. *Arch Neurosci*. 2018;**5**(4).

Arbabi M, Zebardast J, Noorbala AA, Mohamadi M, Rahimnia M, Larijani R. Efficacy of Liaison Education and Environmental Changes on Delirium Incidence in ICU. *Arch Neurosci*. 2018;**5**(2).

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) 26 May 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) 28 May 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 28 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.