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

Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals
Article DOI: 10.5812/mca.103810
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 11(2); e103810

Peer Review Report for "The Results of Uvulopalatopharyngoplasty in Patients with Moderate Obstructive Sleep Apnea Syndrome Having Cardiac Arrhythmias"

Author(s): Ali Seyed Resuli, Hasan Samur

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	18 Apr 2020
Revised Date:	6 May 2020
Accepted Date:	7 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) — 22 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
I am so thankful for the invitation to the review of this manuscript. It is seems this study is a good work in both title and style of article but some correction has needed:
- Please add numerical values in result part of abstract.
- What was an exclusion criterion?
- What were monitoring in during surgery?
- Please explain about technique of anesthesia and drug doses.
- Have antiarrhythmic drugs been used around the operation?
- Have patients underwent elective or emergency surgery in this study?
- Please explain about authors' contribution.

Final conclusion is: Minor Revision
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Apr 2020

Dear AE,

In This retrospective study, the authors evaluated the effect of UPPP on incidence of arrhythmias in OSAS patients.
However, there are some shortcomings that should be corrected:
- Please explain about co-existing cardiac diseases (such as coronary artery, cardiomyopathy, or valve dis.) in studied patients.
- Please explain more about statistical methods and test that was done especially tests of Table 2.
- What you mean "arrhythmia values"? did you mean the frequency or incidence of arrhythmias?
- Please add units of variables in Table 1.
Final decision: Minor revision is needed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 28 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers' comments, the manuscript needs minor revision.
Sincerely yours;

Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel: EIC | **Revision** (0) 28 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for submitting your valuable manuscript. I would like to inform you that the article needs minor revision according to our expert reviewers' comments. Also please consider and address the similarity report in your revision process.
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 reviewers of The Journal of Cardiovascular Annals:

First of all, thank you for your attention. I made all corrections and restorations to my study on reviewers' requests.

Reviewer 1:

- Please explain about co-existing cardiac diseases (such as coronary artery, cardiomyopathy or valve dis.) in studied patients.

Answer: Add this sentence in text ''In addition to arrhythmias, 11 patients had mild Hypertension in Mild heart diseases and other cardiac diseases were excluded from the study.''

- Please explain more about statistical methods and test that was done specially tests of Table 2.

Answer: Add this sentence in text ''In comparison to independent group differences, the student's t-test was used when parametric test assumptions were provided, and the Mann Whitney U test was used when not provided''

- What you mean "arrhythmia values"? did you mean the frequency or incidence of arrhythmias?

Answer: I corrected as you mention.

- Please add units of variables in Table 1

Answer: I done it.

Reviewer 2:

-Please add numerical values in result part of abstract.

Answer: I done it.

-What was an exclusion criterion?

Answer: the exclusion criterion were the patient does not want surgery, failure to obtain anesthesia approval, having cardiopulmonary and secondary systemic disease, whoes do not come to routine checks.

-What were monitoring in during surgery?

Answer: The cardiac rhythm and all vital functions were monitoring during surgery procedure.

-Please explain about technique of anesthesia and drug doses.

Answer: The operations were performed under general anesthesia (Pentotal 5mg/kg, Atracurium 0.1mg/kg, 50%N2O+50%O2İ and İsoflurane %1) after endotracheal intubation.

-Have antiarrhythmic drugs been used around the operation?

Answer: antiarrhythmic drugs used in the same dosage postoperativly until the first month and then gradually reduced.

-Have patients undergone elective or emergency surgery in this study?

Answer: the patients undergone elective surgery.

-Please explain about authors' contribution.

Answer: UPPP done by otolaryngologis (Dr. Ali Seyed Resuli) and cardiological examinations done by cardiolog (Dr. Hasan Samur)

Yours Sincerely,

Ali Seyed Resuli

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) — 6 May 2020

Dear EIC,
I read the authors' answers to the reviewers' questions and revised the manuscript. They corrected the requested items and the manuscript could be accepted in this step.
Sincerely yours;

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 7 May 2020

Dear Authors,
Thank you for revising the article. Your manuscript is ready for publication.
Regards