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.96919
Published in: Multidisciplinary Cardiovascular Annals: 11(1); e96919

Peer Review Report for "The Effects of Cold Blood Cardioplegia with and without Adenosine on Hemodynamic Status of Patients Undergoing Mitral Valve Surgery"

Author(s): Fahimeh Ghasemi, Rasoul Azarfarin, Sarvenaz Salahi, Bahador Baharestani, Alireza Alizadeh Ghavidel

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Aug 2019
Revised Date: 14 Oct 2019
Accepted Date: 14 Oct 2019

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) — 16 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

Hassan Tatari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 22 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for the helpful study, there are some issues which I would like to be explained by the author:
1- What is the “Cardiopulmonary Heart Surgery” ? (Section: Introduction; Line:14)
2- The word “Pumped” in line 17 (Section: Introduction) seems unnecessary!
3- In Section: Introduction; Line 24, the phrase “Cardiopulmonary Solution” should be changed to “Cardioprotective Solution”
4- According to the results of this study, although there is no significant difference in “cross-

clamp time" and "rhythm return time" between the two groups, how "Mean Arrest Time" is shorter in the intervention group?!
Thank you

mahdi Daliri: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 30 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
I read the article. I think it's good but it's better the samples were more.
Best wishes

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision according to the reviewers' comments.
Bests

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Oct 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
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.

Reply to Reviewers:

Dear Reviewers:

Thank you very much for taking your time and reviewing our manuscript. We have made necessary changes according to your valuable comments and the edited parts have been highlighted in the manuscript for your attention.

Bests

Corresponding Author

Responses:

1-What is the “Cardiopulmonary Heart Surgery”? (Section: Introduction; Line: 14)

- It has changed to cardiac surgery

2-The word “Pumped” in line 17 (Section: Introduction) seems unnecessary!

- The word “Pump” in line 17 has been removed according to your recommendation

3-In Section: Introduction; Line 24, the phrase “Cardiopulmonary Solution” should be changed to “Cardioprotective Solution”

- The mentioned word has changed to “Cardioplegic solution” in the manuscript.

4-According to the results of this study, although there is no significant difference in “cross clamp time” and “rhythm return time” between two groups, how “Mean Arrest Time” is shorter in intervention group?!

- Thank you for your precise editing and your valuable comment. The phrase “mean arrest time” was changed to “time required for inducing cardiac arrest” which means the time between starting cardioplegic solution and electrical cardiac arrest which is in seconds not minutes. This has also been corrected in the tables.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 14 Oct 2019

Dear Authors
Thank you very much for taking your time and making the necessary changes in the manuscript according to reviewers' comments.
Bests