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://brieflands.com/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.102883
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 22(5); e102883

Peer Review Report for "The Effect of Ginger and Ondansetron on Post-Operative Nausea and Vomiting in Patients Undergoing Eye Surgery: A Triple-Blind Clinical Trial"

Author(s): Shahnam Sedighmaroufi, Ali Abbaskhani Davanloo, Parisa Moradimajd , Hamidreza Samaee, Mohammad Lavaie

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	28 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	12 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	17 Jul 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) 1 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Comments for the authros:
1. Change the “incidence” by “frequency” both in the abstract and text.
2. Report the main findings quantitatively in the abstract.
3. Reporting exact P-value in the text and Tables is necessary.
4. Time of the study is not clear in the methods.
5. There was no information about sample size calculation.
6. Describe random sampling and random allocation procedures in details.
7. How about statistical methods, software and level of sig?
8. Where is title of Figure 1?
9. The quality of Figure 1 is very poor.
10. The incidence of vomiting was 11% in the Ginger group, 18% in the ondansetron group and 26% in the placebo group at which time?

11. In Table 1, show decimals using “.”
12. Revise Figure 2.
13. Add P-values in the Figures.

Thanks

afshin Amini: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 7 Jul 2020

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

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.

Reviewer 1:

Thanks for your good comments

comment	***Edit***
1. Change the "incidence" by "frequency" both in the abstract and text.	*"incidence" change by "frequency" in all of the abstract and text*
2. Report the main findings quantitatively in the abstract.	*Abstract, page 1, results revised* Of the 148 participants, 54% were men and 46% were women. Average of age was in group Ginger (36/14± 2/17), group Ondansetron (36/24±2/49), and group placebo (36/24±2/20). There was no significant difference among frequency of vomiting in the three groups in immediately after recovery (P=0/19) and 4 hour after surgery (P=0/18). However, in 1, 2 hours after the surgery in ginger and Ondansetron group's frequency of vomiting were significantly lower than that in the control group. (P=0.003) No significant difference was observed in severity of nausea between three groups at certain times (P>0.05) In terms of need for injection antiemetic drugs after surgery was not significantly difference. (P= 0.2)
3. Reporting exact P-value in the text and Tables is necessary.	
4. Time of the study is not clear in the methods.	Study conducted from September 2016 to December 2018.
5. There was no information about sample size calculation.	Sample size was determine based on p = 0/4, p2= 0/15, =1/96, =. /84 1 $z1 - \alpha/2$ $z1 - \beta$ and d=. /25.
6. Describe random sampling and random allocation procedures in details.	Simple randomized sampling procedure was carried out on the basis of study criteria using the "Random Allocation Software" program, All eligible patients were randomly by sealed envelopes divided into three groups (A) Ginger, (B) Ondansetron, and (C) Placebo capsule. Sample recruitment process showed in fig 1.
7. How about statistical methods, software and level of sig?	*t*he quantitative variables were compared using paired t test or one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey test for pairwise comparisons. The comparison of qualitative variables was performed using contingency tables, chi-square, or Fisher's exact test. A p value of ≤0.05 was considered statistically significant.

8. Where is title of Figure 1?	Title of figure 1 is: consort 2010 flow diagram that added to figure
9. The quality of Figure 1 is very poor.	Edited
10. The incidence of vomiting was 11% in the Ginger group, 18% in the ondansetron group and 26% in the placebo group at which time?	*Edited*
11. In Table 1, show decimals using "."	*Edited*
12. Revise Figure 2.	*Revised*
13. Add P-values in the Figures.	*Added*

Associate editor1:

Thanks for your good comments

comments	***Edit***
Do not use abbreviations in the title	Comparison the effect of Ginger and Ondansetron on Post-Operative Nausea and Vomiting in patients undergoing eye surgery: A triple blind clinical trial
Ondansetron spelling was wrong one time	*Edited*
Need to mention P-value in text and table as well	*Edited*
Should stipulate the time after surgery when evaluating patients for nausea and vomiting	*Edited* 1 hour, 2 hour and 4 hour after recovery from anesthesia
Add statistical method	*Edited* the quantitative variables were compared using paired t test or one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey test for pairwise comparisons. The comparison of qualitative variables was performed using contingency tables, chi-square, or Fisher's exact test. A p value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.
All figures need to have the title	*Edited*

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)** 17 Jul 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.