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

Thrita
Article DOI: 10.5812/thrita.64633
Published in: Thrita: 7(2); e64633

# Peer Review Report for "Mind's Relaxation and Diaphragmatic Respiration on the Basis of Scientific Yoga and Its Application in Neurodegenerative Diseases"

**Author(s):** Masoud Eslami , Seyed Behnamedin Jameie, Seyed Behnamedin Jameie, Raheleh Mollajani, Jinous Manouchehri

## Review Timeline:

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 1 Dec 2017 |
| Revised Date: | 30 Dec 2018 |
| Accepted Date: | 2 Jan 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) — 15 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
This article is excellent and practical. Due to problems such as stress, discomfort and etc, pay attention to Diaphragmatic Respiration is very useful today. MRDR can help improve breathing, lung function and it can promote mindful eating and healthy eating habits, that these are very important for quality of life.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The reviewer comments as below :
The study entitled "Mind's Relaxation and Diaphragmatic Respiration on Base of Scientific Yoga and its Application in Neurodegenerative Diseases" is quite an important and interesting. However, this manuscript remains sketchy and this reviewer has some serious concerns as below.

1- The manuscript is a mini-review, not an article review
2- The aim of the review is not provided in the manuscript
3- Three - Five articles of the author in this area should be mentioned in the manuscript with descriptions.
4- What is the main gape that will be answer in the manuscript? The author should be proposed hypothesis/ hypotheses thought of manuscript
5- The manuscript has only an introduction and did not well structured based on the article review format.
Regards

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Dec 2018

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the manuscript to this journal there are some reviewers comments at the bottom of the letter. As we are facilitating the reviewing procedure, we are expecting to receive the revised version in 5 days.
Regards.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Dec 2018

Dear Author,
Thank you for submitting your manuscript to this journal there are some reviewers comments at the bottom of the letter. As we are facilitating the reviewing procedure, we are expecting to receive your revised version in 5 days.
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.

Dated 25/12/2018

To:
Editor, Thrita Journal

Dear Sir

While appreciating your email regarding manuscript ID: 64633 dated 22/12/2018 in reply to the comments of respected reviewer 2, the following points are furnished the **"Major Revision".**

Q 1: The manuscript is a mini not article review.

A: Followed by discussion with the respected Editor of the Thrita Journal it was decided that the manuscript entitled “Mind’s Relaxation and Diaphragmatic Respiration on Base of Scientific Yoga and its Application in Neurodegenerative Diseases” should be expressed in form of Mini Review.

Q2: The aim of the review is not provided in the manuscript.

A: The aim of the review has focused in the conclusion part of the manuscript as follow:

As conclusion from clinical point of view, especially related to neurodegenerative diseases such as multiple sclerosis (MS), and Alzheimer that the former has been considered as “the Century disease”, stress management through MBIs e.g., Mind’s Relaxation and Diaphragmatic Respiration (MRDR), mindfulness and physical postures of different techniques of scientific Yoga should be projected as a potential role for either prevention or to suppress the progressive rate of the diseases and disorders. Research on MBIs may open the door to the development and testing of a multi-level theory of MBIs, which integrate the biological, psychological, and environmental levels. The neuroscience behind scientific Yoga can help to explain why regular MRDR is so effective in reducing stress and creating balance in the Mind-Body Intervention.

Q3: Three-Five articles of author in this area should be mentioned in the manuscript with descriptions.

A: The concerned articles are included in the manuscript with descriptions i.e. page No5 paragraph 3, reference No.’s 22-25. (Total 5 references including ref. No.4)

Q4: What is the main gape that will be answer in the manuscript? Author should be propose hypothesis/hypothesis thought of manuscript.

A: While concerning the title of manuscript i.e. “Mind’s Relaxation and Diaphragmatic Respiration on Base of Scientific Yoga and its Application in Neurodegenerative Diseases” it is obvious that the main part of manuscript has focused on practical and authentic concepts of

MRDR on neurodegenerative disorders as complementary medicine. It should be noticed that hypothesis or hypothesis thought will emerge only on base of theoretical aspects in which could be originated from previous scientific experiments. Therefore, the matter of discussion of this article in which has constructed on experimentally and practically procedures has no any place for hypothesis expression.

Q5: The manuscript has only introduction and did not well structured based on article review format.

A5: The manuscript possess conclusion (page No6-7) and the design of manuscript has been arranged according to the “Mini Review” manuscript. However, with minor addition and to make differentiation between introduction part and the main text, reader may refer to page No 2 with heading **MRDR and related techniques as physio-psychological functional for stress management.**

With Best Regards

Dr. M Eslami
Neurovirologist, MRDR Practitioner & Scientific Yoga Consultant

**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) 29 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The authors should clearly describe the aim of the study in the abstract and the end paragraph of the introduction.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Dec 2018

Dear EIC,
There are some reviewer comments at the bottom of the letter.
The authors should provide below required footnotes in the main manuscript file:
· Conflict of Interests
· Funding/Support
As we facilitating the reviewer procedure we are expecting to receive your revised version in 1 day.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Dec 2018

Dear Author,
As we facilitating the reviewer procedure we are expecting to receive your revised version in 1 days.
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 EIC**

**The minor revisions include**

- **Adding object of review in the end of the abstract:** To emphasize the significant role of MRDR techniques as complementary medicine in prevention and control of neurodegenerative disorders as well as experimental medicine is the aim of this article.
- **Adding object of review in the end of the introduction:** Nevertheless, the aim of this article is to privilege the generous role of MRDR techniques for prevention and control of neurodegenerative disorders as complementary medicine and also its applications in experimental medicine could be considered.
- **Conflict of interest**: Authors declare no conflict of interest.
- Funding: Nir

**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) 2 Jan 2019

Dear Author,
Thank you very much for considering thrita journal for publication of your paper. I'm pleased to confirm that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in Thrita.
Thanks.