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

Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/ijpbs.100888
Published in: Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences: 14(3); e100888

Peer Review Report for "Metoclopramide-Induced Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome: A Review Study"

Author(s): Ideh Ghafour, Forouzan Elyasi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 12 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 9 May 2020
Accepted Date: 29 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) — 24 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The issues that seem to be addressed most in the discussion include:
1. Strengths and weaknesses.
2. Consideration of alternative explanations for the observed results.
3. Guidelines for future research.
4. Table 1 and 2 requires a review to complete and edit a number of data.
5. Table 2 has many misspellings.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Please the authors write the generic name of the drugs in tables.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires

considerable revision and should be modified according to the reviewers' comments which are appended below.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 8 Mar 2020

Dear Author,
Your paper has been evaluated by external peer reviewers. Please do your revisions according to the reviewers' comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
After revision authors are obliged to upload reviewers' comments word file in which they have replied to all comments one by one.
Besides, please pay attention to the word count limitation:
Word count limits are declared in this link: http://kowsarpub.com/en/index.php/services/for-authors/895-word-count
We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript. Thank you for sending your work to the Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences.
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 Editor of chief

We thank the reviewers for their careful read and thoughtful comments on previous draft. We have carefully taken their comments into consideration in preparing our revision, which has resulted in a paper that is clearer, more compelling, and broader. The following summarizes how we responded to reviewer comments.

Best regard

Forouzan Elyasi

Replies to comments:

Reviewer 1:

The issues that seem to be addressed most in the discussion include:

1. Strengths and weaknesses

Answer: Added to the manuscript.

2. Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results

Answer: Differential diagnosis and alternative explanation is discussed in discussion part.

3. Guidelines for future research

Answer: Added to the manuscript.

4. Table 1 and 2 requires a review to complete and edit a number of data.

Answer: Tables completed.

5. Table 2 has many misspellings.

Answer: Misspellings corrected.

Reviewer 2:

please write the generic name of the drugs in tables.

Answer: The generic name added.

Reviewer 3:

1- **The full text of a review article contains the below sections:**
1.Context: It includes 1 or 2 sentences describing the clinical question or issue and its importance in clinical practice or public health.
2.Evidence Acquisition: This section describes the data sources, including the research strategies, time of the study, and other sources of the used materials, such as subsequent reference searches of retrieved articles. It explains the methods used for quality assessment and the inclusion of identified articles.
3.Results: This section addresses the major findings of the review of the clinical issue or topic in an evidence-based, objective, and balanced style, emphasizing the available highest-quality evidence.
4.Conclusions: It clearly states the conclusions to answer the posed questions, if applicable, based on the conclusions of the available evidence, and it emphasizes how clinicians should apply the current knowledge.

Answer: Done.

2- **Although you have done in the abstract, terms appearing frequently (three or more times) within the main text of the paper may be abbreviated, but should be spelled out at first citation, with the abbreviation following in parentheses.**

Answer: Done.

3- **This sentence is unnecessary and should be omitted.**

Answer: Done.

4- **Please mention the reason.**
Answer: Due to non-English language of those 4 articles.

5- Discuss these deaths too.
Answer: added to the manuscript.

6- **Authors have not mentioned anything about CPK, Blood Pressure, hypermetabolism and Diaphoresis in the results, nor in the conclusion.**
Answer: added to the manuscript.

7- **Authors have not mentioned anything about CPK, Blood Pressure, hypermetabolism and Diaphoresis in the results, nor in the conclusion.**
Answer: Main symptoms of NMS of each article is fully discussed in Table 2.

8**- Authors should add footnotes.**
Answer: Footnotes added.

9- **Please write the generic name of the drugs.**
Answer: The generic name of the drugs added.

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)** 19 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
This is with further reference to the paper submitted for possible publication in IJPBS.
The paper has been carefully reviewed and it is suggested that the manuscript requires some more revisions and should be modified according to the comments which are appended below.
1. In both the summary and the main text of the article, mention how many articles remained to be reviewed. Are the remained articles “single case report”s or “case series”. If each article introduces only one patient, specify in the manuscript.
2. The revised text needs to be edited in English terms, especially the last paragraph of the “discussion” as well as the “conclusion” section.
3. In Figure 1, in each box, you have mentioned the number of remained articles, along with the reason for deleting other articles. The reason for deleting articles should be mentioned in the step before the box (on the arrows).
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 19 Apr 2020

Dear Author,
Thank you for your recent revisions.
Your paper has now been evaluated again. According to the associate editor’s comments, it needs some more revisions. Please do your revisions according to these comments. I appreciate you doing the revisions as soon as possible by using the track changes mode in MS Word and using colored text.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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.

Replies to **associate editor's comments:**

1- **In both the summary and the main text of the article, mention how many articles remained to be reviewed. Are the remained articles "single case report"s or "case series". If each article introduces only one patient, specify in the manuscript.**

Answer: The final number of articles added to summary and main text. All the articles were case reports. Further information is available Table 2.

2- ***The revised text needs to be edited in English term, especially the last paragraph of the "discussion" as well as the "conclusion" section.***
Answer: Done.

3- **In Figure 1, in each box, you have mentioned the number of remained articles, along with the reason for deleting other articles. The reason for deleting articles should be mentioned in the step before the box (on the arrows).**
Answer: Figure 1 updated.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

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

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 29 May 2020

Dear AE,
The revised version of the manuscript is acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 29 May 2020

Dear EIC,
It is a pleasure to accept the manuscript in its current form for publication in Iranian Journal of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences (IJPBS).
Thanks for this fine contribution.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 29 May 2020

Dear Author,
We have completed our review of your manuscript and are pleased to inform you that it is considered for publication in the IJPBS. Note that the publication of your article will only be finalized upon your cooperation with the editorial processing.
Thank you for your fine contribution. On behalf of the Editors of IJPBS, we look forward to your continued contributions to the Journal.
Thanks.