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.96751
Published in: Shiraz E-Medical Journal: 21(8); e96751

Peer Review Report for "A Comparative Study on the Use of Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pump for the Control of Pain After Posterior Fusion Operations: A Randomized Controlled Trial"

Author(s): Valiollah Hassani, Seyed Hamid Reza Faiz, Poupak Rahimzadeh, Nasim Nikoubakht, Mohammad Ghaemi, Azadeh Sayarifard

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 31 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 24 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 24 Mar 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 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Type of the study is not clear in the title.
2. Using descriptive statistics report your main results in the abstract quantitatively.
3. Sample size is not clear in the abstract.
4. Display RCT flowchart.
5. Where are the results of repeated measurement analysis? There was no finding for within-group comparisons.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is full of basic structural and methodological flaws and cannot be published in a prestigious medical journal. Also, there is no novelty in the subject.

Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0)

25 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for submitting their manuscript entitled: A Comparative Study of Using Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pumps to Control Pain after Posterior Spine Fusion Surgery, to E medical journal.
This study is an interesting study regarding acute pain control in patients undergoing posterior spinal fusion however you should consider the following comments in this manuscript.
1. In the title: It's better to clear the type of study in the title.
2. In the abstract: Your keywords are not in the MeSH. Please choose keywords that are in the MeSH system.
3. Introduction: This part of the manuscript is very dispersed, you should write this part in three consequent paragraphs.
4. Methods: Because this study is a clinical trial you have to write this part of the manuscript according to Consort which means the blindness, randomization, primary and secondary outcomes, ….should be clear and also needs consort table.
5. Discussion: Like the introduction, you have to write this part according to medical journalism style.
6. Finally this manuscript should be edited by a native editor.
Best regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

29 Dec 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.

Dear Professor

Editor-in-Chief,

Shiraz E- medical Journal

We are highly pleased to have an opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript entitled “A Comparative Study on the Use of Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pump for the Control of Pain After Posterior Fusion Operations: a randomized controlled trial” in your journal.

We greatly appreciate you, the editors and the reviewer for taking time to provide constructive comments which helped improve this manuscript. We have carefully considered your comments and insightful queries rose by reviewer and tried to provide a detailed response to each comment.

Here you can find our responses to reviewer's comments. We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission. We would be glad to respond to any further questions and comments that you may have.

Sincerely yours,

Reviewer 1	1.Type of the study is not clear in the title. 2. Using descriptive statistics report your main results in the abstract quantitatively. 3. Sample size is not clear in the abstract. 4. Display RCT flowchart. 5. Where are the results of repeated measurement analysis? There was no finding for within group comparisons.	1- A Comparative Study on the Use of Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pump for the Control of Pain After Posterior Fusion Operations**: a randomized controlled trial** 2-: There was no significant difference between age, sex, BMI, underlying diseases, smoking in patients with posterior spine fusion surgery in the two groups 2-: This is a clinical trial study. In this research, **72** patients under posterior spine fusion surgery who referred to Rasoul-e-Akram Hospital in 2018 were randomly assigned to two groups namely

		ketamine and apotel infusion pumps. 4-table 4 5-table 2
Reviewer 2	The manuscript is full of basic structural and methodological flaws and cannot be published in a prestigious medical journal. Also there is no novelty in the subject.	
Associate Editor 1	1. In the title: Its better to clear type of study in the title. 2. In the abstract: Your key words are not in the MeSH. Please choose key words that are in the MeSH system. 3. Introduction: This part of manuscript is very disperse, you should write this part in three consequent paragraph. 4. Methods: Because this study is a clinical trial you have to write this part of manuscript according to Consort that means the blindness, randomization, primary and secondary outcomes, ….should be clear and also needs consort table.	1- A Comparative Study on the Use of Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pump for the Control of Pain After Posterior Fusion Operations**: a randomized controlled trial** 2-**Keywords**:Ketamine hydrochloride, Paracetamol, spinal fusion 3-). Pain control after spine surgery in patients who had spinal fusion surgery is a major problem.A reseaon for this pain is extensive damage to soft tissue, bones and muscles. In the present study, the analgesic efcacy and safety of intravenous ketamine infusion for pain management in patients is compared with intravenous infusion

		apotel in spondylolisthesis who had undergone lumbar spinal fusion and instrumentation were evaluated. Accordingly, in this study, we strived to compare the effect of ketamine and apotel in pain pump to control postoperative pain in posterior spine fusion surgery. 4- This study was conducted as a double-blind randomized clinical trial.The research was approved Ethics Committee of Iran University of Medical Sciences and was registered at the IRCT Center under the code No.IRCT20190430043430N1

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.

Mohammad Sahmeddini: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 13 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for submitting the revised manuscript to the shiraz E-Medical journal, I read the manuscript, right now it was more acceptable just need a medical journalist edition.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Feb 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.

Dear Professor

Editor-in-Chief,

Shiraz E- medical Journal

We are highly pleased to have an opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript entitled “A Comparative Study on the Use of Ketamine and Apotel Infusion Pump for the Control of Pain After Posterior Fusion Operations: a randomized controlled trial” in your journal.

We greatly appreciate you, the editors and the reviewer for taking time to provide constructive comments which helped improve this manuscript. We have carefully considered your comments and insightful queries rose by reviewer.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission. We would be glad to respond to any further questions and comments that you may have.

Sincerely yours,

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Dear colleagues
Thank you for submitting revised manuscript to the shiraz E-Medical journal, I red the manuscript , right now it was more acceptable just need a medical journalist edition.

Reply: Dear editor, thank you so much for the comment. We sent the paper to an editing service to edit the paper. All require changes were done.

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) 24 Mar 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.