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.98691
Published in: Archives of Neuroscience: 7(1); e98691

Peer Review Report for "Accuracy of Stroke Diagnosis Using FAST (Face, Arm, Speech, Time) Tool by Emergency Medical Service Dispatchers and Technicians and its Impact on Transport Time"

Author(s): Peyman Saberian, Nader Tavakoli, Parisa Hasani-Sharamin, Mehrad Aghili, Alireza Baratloo

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Oct 2019
Revised Date: 16 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 27 Nov 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Ehsan Karimialavijeh: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 17 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
The subject of the study is important for the timely management of acute ischemic strokes. I appreciate the work done by the authors in evaluating the accuracy of the FAST in the detection of ischemic CVAs. I have listed my opinions below:
Abstract
If AUC for EMDs is 0.5, the tool is not accurate for them, so the conclusion should be revised.
Introduction:
The introduction needs English proof, but the overall structure is acceptable.
Methods:
It is following the STROBE, but the text needs proof.
Results:
Is presented in standard order.
Discussion:
As previously stated, the conclusion needs revision.

Thanks.

Sincerely

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 9 Nov 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) 11 Nov 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.

Reply to reviewer comments

Manuscript ID:	98691
Title:	Accuracy of stroke diagnosis by emergency medical service dispatchers and technicians using FAST (Face, Arm, Speech, Time) tool and its impact on transfer time

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
The subject of the study is important for the timely management of acute ischemic strokes. I appreciate the work done by the authors in evaluating the accuracy of the FAST in the detection of ischemic CVAs. I have listed my opinions below:
Thanks for your positive comment.

Abstract
If AUC for EMDs is 0.5, the tool is not accurate for them, so the conclusion should be revised.
Revised.

Introduction:
The introduction needs English proof, but the overall structure is acceptable.
If accepted the whole paper will be edited by the publisher English editor.

Methods:
It is following the STROBE, but the text needs proof.
We have tried to write the whole paper based on the related guideline.

Results:
Is presented in standard order.
Thanks

Discussion:
As previously stated, the conclusion needs revision.
Revised.

Sincerely
Kind Regards

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) — 25 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have improved the manuscript and the revision is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 27 Nov 2019

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 27 Nov 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.