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 "**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:

Peer Review

Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences
Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.5812/jkums.111028
Published in: Journal of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences: 25(2) ; e111028

Peer Review Report for "Epidemiological Evidence of the Recent Surge in MS in Asia and Australia: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): sharareh Eskandarieh, Mohammad Ali Sahraian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	9 Nov 2020
Revised Date:	13 Mar 2021
Accepted Date:	10 Apr 2021

Revision (0)

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

Aalireza Khatoony : Reviewer

15 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
This article is not suitable for publication.
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.

Response to Reviewer:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We would like to thank you for the time and effort that you dedicated to help us improve our paper and the opportunity to revise the manuscript. We appreciate your careful comments and valuable suggestions. We have now revised the manuscript to incorporate the reviewers' suggestions. The revised part is selected by yellow highlight.

Title: The title is novel and it seems to be important now.

Abstract

The " Background " and " Objective " sections are the same. Please mention the importance of the issue in the Background not your object or method.

Response: Thanks for your attention and helpful comment. We revised background according to reviewer comment.

In the "Findings" section, please look more closely at the incidence and prevalence of the MS in Asia and Australia. You can comparison results in different countries.

Response: Thanks for your helpful comment. We revised finding according to reviewer comment and compared results in different countries.

Keywords

Please add the " Australia " to keywords.

Response: We added Australia in keywords.

Background

I recommend that the statistics provided in the background must be updated (for example, paragraph 2, 4)

Response: We updated statistics provided in background according to reviewer comment.

Please talk more about the importance of the MS and its effects on communities. The background is short.

Response: We added 2 paragraph and talked more about the importance of the MS and its burden effects.

Method

For all method section: Please edit this section based on included sections PRISMA Checklist. For example:

In Method section, recommended to add the "protocol and registration" section that included the registration ID and center.

Please add the eligibly criteria in separate section. ..... etc...

Response: We edit method section according to reviewer comments and separated eligibly criteria and protocol and registration.

Suggestion for future studies: you can report the studies based on Garrard Table.

Response: We added suggestion for future studied in end of method section .

Findings

I recommend you to do a meta-analysis for prevalence and incidence if possible. If it was impossible please mention the reasons (example I2, ...)

Response: Due to the large differences in the amount of statistics reported in different countries and the heterogeneity between

them, we did not perform meta-analysis according to scientific evidences/references.

I findings is better to report the summary of received results and referee to tables. You have reported all the articles separately, which are similar to the tables and are duplicates. Please edit that.

Response: We report the summary of received results and deleted duplicates according to reviewer comments.

Discussion

It is recommending you to discuss about possible reasons for increase/or decrease in prevalence and incidence of MS.

Similarly, please discuss about possible reasons for difference prevalence/incidence rate of MS between countries.

Response: We discussed about possible reasons for increase/or decrease in prevalence and incidence of MS among people and different countries in 2 paragraph in end of discussion.

Conclusion

That was suitable and OK.

References

That was suitable and OK.

Figures and tables:

Please add mention for fig1

Response: We mention for fig1

Please add reference for image in fig1

Response: We added reference for image in fig1

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)