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

Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Article DOI: 10.5812/zjrms.85773
Published in: Zahedan Journal of Research in Medical Sciences: 21(2); e85773

Peer Review Report for "Rehabilitation Strategies of Dysphagia in a Patient with Multiple Sclerosis: A Case Study"

Author(s): Morteza Farazi, Zahra Ilkhani, Shahrzad Jaferi, Mahbubeh Haghighi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Oct 2018
Revised Date:	24 Feb 2019
Accepted Date:	2 Mar 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) — 12 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is suitable for publish it gives good therapy for MS patients. The English of the manuscript is good. Here are some comments for the authors.
Abstract:
1- At abstract part line 4 the words “Clinical Bedside Swallowing” should be written in lowercase.
2- In keywords capitalize each word. Also, correct the English of Keyword it is one word don’t put space between them.
3- References in the text is not according to the journal guidelines.
4- In Introduction line 20 it is better to use about instead of around.
5- On page 6 delete the comma in the parenthesis. “kheer (phirni,)”
6- On page 7 conclusion part line 7 put space between these words “inpatient”
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
Comment for the authors:

- Have Western Aphasia Battery and Clinical Bedside Swallowing Assessment tests score? If Yes, please mention before and after scores.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 18 Feb 2019

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** (0) 18 Feb 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.

Reviewer 1:

1. It has corrected. Line 6
2. It has corrected. Line 10
3. It has corrected. Line 192-210
4. It has corrected. Line 42
5. It has corrected. Line 99.
6. It has corrected. Line 167

Reviewer 2

It has corrected. Line 82- 130

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) — 27 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
The authors did all comment exactly. the manuscript is suitable for publication now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 28 Feb 2019

Dear AE,
The comments are done.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 2 Mar 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 2 Mar 2019

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