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

Iranian Journal of Radiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/iranjradiol.100510
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(3); e100510

Peer Review Report for "Partial Anomalous Left Pulmonary Artery: A Case Report and Literature Review"

Author(s): Chia Hung Chen, Pei San Tsai, Dao Chen Lin, Yu Peng Liu, Kun Shan Cheng

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 1 Jan 2020
- Revised Date: 10 Jun 2020
- Accepted Date: 16 Jun 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) — 27 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The submitted manuscript dealt with a case of partially anomalous left pulmonary artery (PALPA) echocardiographic and CT-angiographic findings.
The reported patient might be regarded as a case report, in terms of its remarkably rare occurrence. No similar case of PALPA supplying the left pulmonary upper lobe has been reported, before.
The major concerns with the manuscript are as follows:
1- There are several grammatical points through the text, to be rectified.
2- The authors are assumed to provide data regarding the issue of whether or not this anomaly was diagnosed prenatally using fetal ultrasonic assessments or fetal echocardiography.
3- Please clarify the type of cardiac murmur that was heard.
4- The prognosis of PALPA is recommended to be discussed, in a more detailed manner. The readers might be interested to know about the disease prognosis.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Feb 2020

AE,

I reviewed the manuscript as “Partial anomalous left pulmonary artery: a case report and literature”, It was an interesting and rare case, I have a few questions and comments as following:

1- In most literature, this anomalous vessel is abbreviated as PLPA, but in your manuscript it is PALPA, I recommend changing it to a more common abbreviation.

2- Did your case had any skeletal abnormality, especially in CXR? If any please add it.

3- In CT scan images, please change the window level of CT images in the CT workstation for better visualization of arteries.

Thanks.

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

17 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,

The manuscript so-called "partial anomalous left pulmonary artery a case report and literature review with ID100510" needs major revision according to the comments of reviewers.

Thanks.

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

18 Feb 2020

Dear Authors,

Your article needs Major Revision.

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.

Dear Reviewer and Editor:

We thank Reviewer and Editor for the constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript. The original comments of Reviewer and Editor are listed below (in italics and bold) followed by our response to each comment.

Reviewer 1:

1- There are several grammatical points through the text, to be rectified.

Thanks for your suggestion and we had rectified the grammar by specialist of English editing.

2- The authors are assumed to provide data regarding the issue of whether or not this anomaly was diagnosed prenatally using fetal ultrasonic assessments or fetal echocardiography.

There is neither prenatal examination record nor fetal echocardiography to figure out whether there are congenital disorders.

3- Please clarify the type of cardiac murmur was heard.

The cardiac murmur was grade I/VI systolic murmur over upper sternal border.
We have added the cardiac murmur type within the manuscript.

4- The prognosis of PALPA is recommended to be discussed, in a more detailed manner. The readers might be interested to know about the disease prognosis.

We have discussed the prognosis about PLPA within the manuscript as your suggestion.

Reviewer 2:

1- In most of literature this anomalous vessel is abbreviated as PLPA, but in your manuscript it is PALPA, I recommend to change it to more common abbreviation.

We have changed the abbreviation PLPA in our article.

2- Did your case had any skeletal abnormality especially in CXR? If any please add it.

We have reviewed the girl's chest and abdominal plain films. However, there was no any skeletal anomalies or abnormalities demonstrated.

3- In CT scan images, please change the window level of CT images in CT workstation for better visualization of arteries.

We have changed the window level of CT images as your suggestion.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 16 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
All comments of reviewers are responded to or added to the manuscript by dear authors. This is accepted except for one probably mistake In abstract: Echocardiography and computed tomography (CT) examination
demonstrated that the anomalous artery originated from the right pulmonary artery supplying the left lower lobe? Please change it to left upper lobe .
Thanks.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision (1)** 17 Mar 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

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 Editor:

We thank the Editor for the suggestions on our manuscript. The original comments of Editor are listed below (in italics and bold) followed by our response to each comment.

Editor

This is accepted except for one probably mistake In abstract : Echocardiography and computed tomography (CT) examination demonstrated that the anomalous artery originated from the right pulmonary artery supplying the left lower lobe? Please change it to left upper lobe.

Thanks for Editor's comment and correction. We had changed the left lower lobe to left upper lobe in abstract.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 22 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
I reviewed the revised manuscript as" Partial anomalous left pulmonary artery: a case report and literature review". The requested changes have been made.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 11 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The authors appropriately responded to queries.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 13 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript with ID 100510 is accepted for publishing at IJR.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 26 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should respond to the following comment. Then, highlight any changes they make in the manuscript.
In Table 1, what do you mean by, “suspicion, no”? Please clarify.
Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 27 May 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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 Reviewer and Editor:

We thank Reviewer and Editor for the constructive comments and suggestions in our manuscript. The original comments are listed below (in italics and bold) followed by our response to each comment.

Editor 2:
In Table 1, what do you mean by, "suspicion, no"? Please clarify.
Thanks for editor's comment. Due to format error, we have corrected the mistake as highlight in table 1.

Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 4 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should respond to the following comment. Then, highlight any changes you make in the manuscript.
In the figures, please add arrows to the images.
Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 6 Jun 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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 Reviewer and Editor:

We thank Reviewer and Editor for the constructive comments and suggestions in our manuscript. The original comments are listed below (in italics and bold) followed by our response to each comment.

Editor 1:
In the figures, please add arrows on the images.
Thanks for editor's suggestion. We have added arrows on the images in the figures.

Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (4) 15 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 16 Jun 2020

Dear authors,
Your article is acceptable for the publication in IJR.
Regards