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.68994
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 9(2); e68994

Peer Review Report for "The Role of Bradykinin and Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibitors in Myocardial Protection: A Review of Randomized Control Trials"

Author(s): Shervin Ziabakhsh Tabary, Alireza Sanei Motlagh

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Mar 2018
Revised Date: 23 Jul 2018
Accepted Date: 6 Aug 2018

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)

5 Apr 2018

Dear AE,
With regard to the manuscript " The role of bradykinin in myocardial protection: A systematic review of randomized control trials ".
- This is a systematic review without any meta-analysis and the aim of study is to evaluate the controversial effect of RIPC in CABG and PCI.
- This study mentions to eight RCT's from 1996 to 2003 which were summarised in Table 1 and 2.
- The majority of this manuscript is copy-paste of related references without any notable statements on behalf of authors.
- The method and pathway of selecting appropriate articles is admissible, althugh it would be more acceptable if you could to add more RCT's in their study.
- The wealth of Systematic reviews depends on number of reviewed RCT's and absolutely on quality of them and meta-analysis at the end of study. There is not any meta-analysis and number of RCT's are not considerable.
- This manuscript doesn't add anything more to our current knowledge in this topic.
- References and citations are correct and English is acceptable although most of the

manuscript is copy-paste without considerable statements on behalf of authors.
- Altogether, this manuscript is acceptable without any revision by authors.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 10 Apr 2018

Dear EIC,
Interesting topics, it's better in a systematic review to discuss more the power of each RCTs or to add a metanalysis to the study.
- In the title, the role of bradykinin and converting enzyme inhibitors should be addressed.
- English writing and references are acceptable.
- Overall it is a good and useful article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 11 Apr 2018

Dear Authors
Thank you for submitting your valuable review article.
Please revise the manuscript based on the associate editor comments.
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 editor-in-Chief of Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals

First, I would like to appreciate you for review and consideration of our article. We send the file of a manuscript entitled "***The role of bradykinin and angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors in myocardial protection: A systematic review of randomized control trials***". Regarding the comments of dear reviewers, here we mention some points about the review article:

During the process of systematic review, we searched individually the databases that are mentioned in the method of the article. Only randomized clinical trials were considered which included all the RCTs so far.

The main purpose of this study was to demonstrate the role of the bradykinin as a mediator of RIPC in myocardial protection. We also mentioned the potential effect of ACE-I and specially ARB medications in bradykinin liberation. But further studies are needed to support the effect of these drugs.

Unfortunately, the data of RCTs were not coherent and complete, so we couldn't perform the meta-analysis.

We appreciate your support and we will respect the decision you make about this study

Sincerely yours,

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) — 23 Jul 2018

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
- Please revise the manuscript based on the PRISMA statement
- Have you registered the protocol of the study anywhere? Please explain about it
- Please explain why you did not perform a meta-analysis?
- Unfortunately, the necessary details in the methods and results sections were not mentioned suitably. Please revise the sections. PRISMA statement will be helpful in this regards.

Bests

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 23 Jul 2018

Dear EIC,
According to the experts' comments, this valuable manuscript can be accepted to be published as a "Review Article" without any additional changes. However if the authors insist on publishing their article as "Systemic Review", reviewers' comments on their manuscript need to be taken care of and necessary changes needs to be done before re-submission.

Bests

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 23 Jul 2018

Dear Author
Thank you very much for submitting your valuable manuscript to our journal. We are pleased to let you know that your manuscript has been accepted by our expert reviewers, however not as a "Systemic Review" but as a "Review Article". Therefore hereby we would like to submit our decision as "Minor Revision" so that you can change only the submission format to "Review Article" and it would be published in the upcoming issue. Otherwise, if you would like to submit it again as a "Systemic Review" you have to pay attention to the expert reviewers' comments and make necessary changes before submission.
Our recommendation for you is to only change the submission format to "Review Article" and wait for its publication in the next issue of the journal. We are looking forward to receiving more of your valuable manuscripts in the future.

Best regards

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.

Dear editor-in-Chief of Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals

I would like to appreciate you for review and consideration of our article. We send the file of a manuscript entitled "***The role of bradykinin and angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors in myocardial protection: A review of randomized control trials***". As you see, the term "systematic" was removed from the title. Your feedbacks and comments for review article was respectful to us and we respect your decision about the article.

Sincerely yours,

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: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Aug 2018

Dear Authors
Thank you very much for resubmitting your manuscript and considering reviewers' comments in the type of article. Your article is ready for publication in the upcoming issue.
Bests