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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Health Scope
Article DOI: 10.5812/jhealthscope.86578
Published in: Health Scope: 9(2); e86578

# Peer Review Report for "The Role of Ketone Bodies in Improving Neurological Function and Efficiency"

**Author(s):** Deepanshu Naithani, Santosh Kumar Karn

## Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 9 Jan 2020

Revision (0)

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

**Hossein Ansari**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 5 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
I think this manuscript is well written and acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 4 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
- For plagiarism checking, I need specific software that is not available. The appropriate style for references certainly checked by EIC and editorial office of journal.
- The article is not structured (material & methods, Results and Discussion not clarify).
- The type (original article, review article, or ...) of the article is not clear.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 22 Dec 2019

Dear AE
Comments for the authors:
- Please see some of comments mentioned in the text of the manuscript.

- Some of the used references are old and newer references are required.
- Some of the sections are unnecessary and its better to be removed (see your manuscript).
Thanks.

**Hossein Ansari**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jan 2020

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) 9 Jan 2020

Dear author
Manuscript is well written and acceptable for publication.
Best