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

Shiraz E-Medical Journal
Article DOI: 10.5812/semj.96024
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(9); e96024

Peer Review Report for "Midazolam, Etomidate, Propofol, Fentanyl, Ketamine, and Propofol/Ketamine for Procedural Sedation and Analgesia Among Adults in the Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review"

Author(s): Maryam Massaeli, Soheil Nasouhi, Afshin Motallebzadeh, Masoud Shahabian

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	10 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	24 Feb 2020
Accepted Date:	28 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

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

Mohammad Sahmeddini: Reviewer | Revision (0) 4 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitle: Midazolam, Etomidate, Propofol, Fentanyl, and Ketamine, and Propofol/Ketamine for Procedural Sedation and Analgesia Among Adults in Emergency Departments to the shiraz-E-Medical journal. This is an amazing subject in anesthesia and the emergency department. However, there are some kind comments that may be useful in order to improve the quality of your manuscript.
1. In the 3rd paragraph of the introduction the author mentioned that etomidate has [relatively high occurrence of cardiovascular and respiratory depression] but etomidate does not have cardiovascular depression effect.
2. In the same paragraph, midazolam does not have respiratory stability.
3. Nowadays we have a new generation of short-acting or ultra –short-acting for PSA, therefore is not logic to write about long-acting drugs such as diazepam and morphine for PSA.
4. In different parts of the manuscript, the author wrote about the respiratory problem, what do you mean? You mean respiratory depression specifically? Please correct this term.

5. The English language needs to be checked promptly and corrected accordingly in order to understand smoothly the study and results.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 21 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
I have no clinical knowledge, so I have just reviewed the methodology of this manuscript.
In materials and method section
1. The authors said “A specified protocol was specified before the initiation of the study”. Please specify, did you have a registry number?
2. Most randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are with parallel design. What do you mean by eliminating “all parallel randomized” in the Eligibility criteria section?
3. The search strategy is uncompleted. Please include the other databases such as Scopus and Embase.
4. Please attach Syntax Search Strategy for one of the databases for example PubMed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 21 Oct 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 23 Oct 2019

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.

Midazolam, Etomidate, Propofol, Fentanyl, and Ketamine, and Propofol/Ketamine for Procedural Sedation and Analgesia Among Adults in Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review		
Comments:	Answers:	page
Reviewer 1	Dear Editor, We shortened the manuscript as much as we could. However, further elimination may impair the content. We would appreciate it if you could accept the paper with its current length. Thank you very much for your consideration. Kindest regards,	
In the 3rd paragraph of the introduction the author mentioned that etomidate has [relatively high occurrence of cardiovascular and respiratory depression] but etomidate does not have cardiovascular depression effect.	This sentence was edited and its problematic section was deleted	
2. In the same paragraph, midazolam does not have respiratory stability.	This sentence was edited and its problematic section was deleted	
3. Nowadays we have new generation shortacting or ultra –shortacting for PSA, therefore is not logic to write about long acting drugs such as diazepam and morphine for PSA.	Thanks for your attention. However we did not focuse on diazepam or morphine for PSA. They were compared in the reviewed studies and were mentioned to prevent missing data. We explain these agents to determine the effectiveness of new generation shortacting in	

	PSA. Edited in the text as soon as possible	
4. In different part of manuscript, author wrote about respiratory problem , what do you mean? You mean respiratory depression specifically? Please correct this term.	It means respiratory adverse events. It was edited in the manuscript.	
5. The English language needs to be checked promptly and corrected accordingly in order to understand smoothly the study and results.	The manuscript was rechecked to improve the structure	
Reviewer 2:		
1. The authors said “A specified protocol was specified before the initiation of the study”. Please specify, did you have a registry number?	We did not recorde this manuscript in any cite. It means we designed this study based on the Cochrane Handbook	
2. Most randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are with parallel design. What do you mean by eliminating “all parallel randomized” in Eligibility criteria section?	This sentence was improved, meaning that we intend to inserte all randomized clinical trials. Edited in the text	
3. The search strategy is uncompleted. Please include the other databases such as Scopus and Embase.	We added these databases	
4. Please attach Syntax Search Strategy for one of the databases for example: PubMed.	The research strategy is clearly expressed in the text. For more details, attach a model strategy, please.	

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.

reza Tabrizi: Reviewer | **Revision (1)** 4 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
Please the authors respond carefully to our comment:
- Previously in comment 2, We wanted to answer this question "Most randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are with parallel design. What do you mean by eliminating “all parallel randomized” in the Eligibility criteria section?" which authors response: This sentence was improved, meaning that we intend to inserte all randomized clinical trials. Edited in the text.
- Although the authors said that where included the original studies only in the form of randomized controlled trials, however in the following stated that all randomized studies were excluded?
I'm confused please answer carefully.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 25 Jan 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 26 Jan 2020

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 (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.

Comment	Response
Reviewer 1	
Previously in comment 2, We wanted to answer this question "Most randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are with parallel design. What do you mean by eliminating “all parallel randomized” in Eligibility criteria section?" which authors response: This sentence was improved, meaning that we intend to inserte all randomized clinical trials. Edited in the text. Although the authors said that were included the original studies only in the form of randomized controlled trials, however in the following stated that all randomized studies were excluded?	We think that the sentence led to misunderstanding. We included all randomized controlled trials, in which PSA was carried on adults in ED and excluded all prospective observational, in vitro, and retrospective studies. We should have omitted "parallel randomized controlled trials" from the second sentence of materials section. The author would like you to accept our sincere apologies.

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) 28 Feb 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.