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

Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care
Article DOI: 10.5812/jjcdc.114775
Published in: Jundishapur Journal of Chronic Disease Care: In Press(In Press); e114775

Peer Review Report for "Intranasal Ketamine Versus Intravenous Ketorolac for Pain Control in the Renal Colic: A Randomized Clinical Trial Study"

Author(s): Ali Khavanin, Meisam Moezzi , Hassan Motamed , Samaneh Parozan , Abdolreza Hosseini

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 22 Mar 2021
Revised Date: 20 Apr 2021
Accepted Date: 3 May 2021

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) — 26 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
This is not in the scope of the journal. Kidney stone pain is not a chronic disorder.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
I have gone through the manuscript with great interest and can say that the paper was designed well according to the CONSORT checklist. I have only a minor concern, which is the terms about the adverse events. First unify the term through all body text, some places written side effects and in the table for instance as complications. I RCTs, two main points are crucial, the first detail and the type of the complications, and the second, drop out cases and the reasons. Moreover, study limitations are also very important.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the manuscript to JJCDC. Based on our reviewers' comments this article needs some revisions in all parts. I think the authors should explain the manuscript in line with chronic diseases. how these diseases related to chronic diseases. They should explain in the introduction. I recommend they revise the manuscript and get it back as soon as possible.
With regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 12 Apr 2021

Dear Author,
Based on our reviewers' comments, your manuscript needs essential revision in all sections. As you know, one of our reviewers reject your paper but I can a chance for a major revision in your manuscript. Please revise your manuscript and resubmit.
With regards.

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 referees:

We corrected all the raised comments and marked the corrections by yellow highlights to simplify the reviewing process. I appreciate you and your reviewers in advance.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

This is not in the scope of the journal. Kidney stone pain is not a chronic disorder. Thanks

Answer:

Thanks for your attention and comment. With respect to the reviewer's comment, we agree with the point of view of dear reviewer that kidney stone pain is not a chronic disorder, but unsuccessfully in pain management of this disorder, make it to chronic pain in the patient life. This survey aims to achieve an effective therapeutic to prevent the transformation of disease to chronic disorder; in this regard, we choose this journal.

Reviewer 2:

I have gone through the manuscript with great interest, and can say that the paper designed well according to the CONSORT checklist.

Answer:

Thanks for your attention and your positive comments on our manuscript.

I have only minor concern, which is the terms about the adverse events. First unify the term through all body text, some places written side effects and in the table for instance as complications.

Answer:

Following the reviewer request, all "side effects" terms were replaced with "adverse events (AEs)."

I RCTs, two main points are crucial, first detail and the type of the complications, and second, drop out cases and the reasons.

Answer:

In accordance with the reviewer's comment, the common type of complications that can occur were added; also, an explanation about drop-out cases was added.

Moreover, study limitations are also very important.

Answer:

Following the reviewer's request, the limitation was added.

Thanks for your attention and useful comments.

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 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Given all clarifications have been performed by respective authors, I think the corrections are satisfying and can move further for publications.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear EIC,
This manuscript is acceptable in this format.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 3 May 2021

Dear Author,
I think all comments have been made and this manuscript in the current format is acceptable.
Truly Yours.