

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 "[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:

[Peer Review](#)



International Journal of Cancer Management

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5812/ijcm-162212>

Published in: International Journal of Cancer Management: 18(1) ; e162212

Peer Review Report for "Accuracy of MRI Versus Ultrasound/Mammography in Detecting Axillary Lymph Node Involvement in Patients with Breast Cancer"

Author(s): Saba Ebrahimian, Atieh Akbari, Sakineh Soleimani Varaki, Saba Amirhosseini, Mohammad Esmaeil Akbari, Shabnam Ashoftebargi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	26 Apr 2025
Revised Date:	25 May 2025
Accepted Date:	3 Jun 2025

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

7 May 2025

Drear AE,

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The topic is important and clinically relevant. Below are some comments and suggestions that may help improve the clarity and quality of the paper.

Abstract:

In the Methods section, please specify the study's time frame and briefly describe the demographic characteristics. It would also be helpful to clarify how the patient

cohorts were selected.

Background:

Please review the order of the references; currently, reference (2) is cited before reference (1).

The objectives are repeated at the end of the introduction. Consider stating them once clearly to avoid redundancy.

Materials and Methods:

Study Design: The description is clear, but consider briefly explaining why a retrospective observational design was chosen.

Surgical Management: Please clarify the criteria used to decide whether a patient underwent SLNB or ALND, particularly in relation to imaging findings.

Discussion:

When comparing your results with those of Zhou et al., please provide brief context about their study, including sample size and methodology.

Regarding NACT, consider expanding on how it influences nodal assessment and why MRI's low negative predictive value (NPV) is a concern in this context.

In discussing MRI limitations, please also address the issues related to gadolinium use.

Consider including a separate paragraph discussing the limitations of your study.

Given the relatively small number of patients included in the current study, it is recommended to increase the sample size, if feasible, to improve the robustness and generalizability of the results.

References:

Some references appear outdated. It is suggested to update them with more recent studies, such as references 8 and 14.

REFeree : Associate Editor

7 May 2025

Dear EIC,

The manuscript must undergo a thorough revision to address the insightful review comments provided.

REFeree : EIC

7 May 2025

Dear Author,

Please address several key points to ensure thorough and effective investigations and resubmit. Thank you

- 1- Some sentences, particularly in the background and discussion, are long or grammatically awkward (e.g., "which is one of so important part of complete resection..."). Therefore, A professional English language edit is strongly recommended to improve clarity and flow.
- 2-There appears to be a mismatch in the order of in-text citations. For example, citation [2] is introduced before citation [1] in the background section. Please ensure that all references are numbered sequentially based on their first appearance in the text, in accordance with journal formatting guidelines.
- 3- The manuscript states that the study was approved by an institutional ethics committee, but it lacks important details. Please specify the full name of the ethics committee or institutional review board (IRB) that granted approval, and the approval code or reference number is also necessary.

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.

Abstract:

In the Methods section, please specify the study's time frame and briefly describe the demographic characteristics. It would also be helpful to clarify how the patient cohorts were selected.

It was added page 1 paragraph 2

Background:

Please review the order of the references; currently, reference (2) is cited before reference (1).

it was corrected in page 2 paragraph 3

The objectives are repeated at the end of the introduction. Consider stating them once clearly to avoid redundancy.

It was removed page 3 paragraph 3

Materials and Methods:

Study Design: The description is clear, but consider briefly explaining why a retrospective observational design was chosen.

First we tried to evaluate datas that we have if there is diffrenece the design a prospective study.because MRI is expencive and may not always be available

Surgical Management: Please clarify the criteria used to decide whether a patient underwent SLNB or ALND, particularly in relation to imaging findings.

Page 4 paragraph 3 corrected

Discussion:

When comparing your results with those of Zhou et al., please provide brief context about their study, including sample size and methodology.

It is corrected in page 7 paragraph 3

Regarding NACT, consider expanding on how it influences nodal assessment and why MRI's low negative predictive value (NPV) is a concern in this context.

It is added page 8 paragraph 2

In discussing MRI limitations, please also address the issues related to gadolinium use.

page 8 paragraph 3 is added

Consider including a separate paragraph discussing the limitations of your study.

It is added page 9.last paragraph

Given the relatively small number of patients included in the current study, it is recommended to increase the sample size, if feasible, to improve the robustness and generalizability of the results. Future research

It is proposed in limitations to have better.page 9 last paragraph

References:

Some references appear outdated. It is suggested to update them with more recent studies, such as references 8 and 14.

Reference 8 and 14 replaced with newer ones

=====

Ethic approval

IR.SBMU.CRC.REC.1401.032

<https://ethics.research.ac.ir/EthicsProposalView.php?id=315154>

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

REFEREE : EIC

3 Jun 2025

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your work to IJCM