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.102948
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(4); e102948

Peer Review Report for "Imaging Findings of Multiphase CT Angiography of Acute Internal Carotid Artery Occlusion Within 6-Hour Time-Window After Thrombectomy and Its Clinical Implication"

Author(s): Chun-Chao Huang, Chao-Liang Chou, Wei-Ming Huang, Zong-Yi Jhou, Yung-Pin Hwang, Hsin-Yao Lin, Yuan-Hsiung Tsai, Chun-Hsien Lin

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	25 Mar 2020
Revised Date:	22 Jul 2020
Accepted Date:	26 Jul 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) — 3 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Title, Abstract, Introduction, Materials, And Methods, Results, Discussion seems to be ok. There is no obvious problem in methodology.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 6 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
About this manuscript must be said that also the authors try to do a high-quality research but the following points must be considered:
1. Manuscript draft must be written according to journal guideline
2. Manuscript must be edited according to English writing
3. Each word firstly must be written in full format and then if necessary can be written in brief; but, the number of brief words must be fewer for easier understanding

4. The sample size 32 is very small and this casts doubt on the results of the study
5. Method of study must be written more clear and by sub-titles. Must be described about all variables, their measurement and data collection obviously. Finally, must be added a sub-title section as statistical analysis and be explained about descriptive and analytical measures and test that used.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
About this manuscript must be said that also the authors try to do a high-quality research but the following points must be considered:
1. Manuscript draft must be written according to journal guideline
2. Manuscript must be edited according to English writing
3. Each word firstly must be written in full format and then if necessary can be written in brief; but, the number of brief words must be fewer for easier understanding
4. The sample size 32 is very small and this casts doubt on the results of the study
5. Method of study must be written more clear and by sub-titles. Must be described about all variables, their measurement and data collection obviously. Finally, must be added a sub-title section as statistical analysis and be explained about descriptive and analytical measures and test that used.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 27 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
Your article needs Minor 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.

Response to reviewers' comment

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Hi
About this manuscript must be said that also the authors try to do a high-quality research but the following points must be considered:
1. Manuscript draft must be written according to journal guideline
Response:
Thanks for this comment. We had modified the format of this manuscript according to the journal guideline.

2. Manuscript must be edited according to English writing
Response:
We have sent this manuscript for English editing.

3. Each word firstly must be written in full format and then if necessary can be written in brief; but, the number of brief words must be fewer for easier understanding
Response:
Thanks for this comments. We made several modifications for this point, including adding full format of the brief words at the first use and deleting some brief words, which are not used frequently in this manuscript.

4. The sample size 32 is very small and this casts doubt on the results of the study
Response:
Thanks for this comment. The case number is really limited and will undermine the results of this study. We add a paragraph at the end of Discussion section to describe some limitations in this study, including the case number. Further, a prospective study with a larger case number will be helpful to confirm the results of this study.

5. Method of study must be written more clear and by sub-titles. Must be described about all variables, their measurement and data collection obviously. Finally, must be

added a sub-title section as statistical analysis and be explained about descriptive and analytical measures and test that used.

Response:

Thanks for this comment. We had modified the section of Method, including subtitles and more detail information.

Reviewer 2:

Title,Abstract, Introduction

Materials And Methods

Results

Discussion

seems to be ok.

there is no obvious problem in methodology.

Response:

Thanks for your comments.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

bout this manuscript must be said that also the authors try to do a high-quality research but the following points must be considered:

1. Manuscript draft must be written according to journal guideline
2. Manuscript must be edited according to English writing
3. Each word firstly must be written in full format and then if necessary can be written in brief; but, the number of brief words must be fewer for easier understanding
4. The sample size 32 is very small and this casts doubt on the results of the study
5. Method of study must be written more clear and by sub-titles. Must be described about all variables, their measurement and data collection obviously. Finally, must be added a sub-title section as statistical analysis and be explained about descriptive and analytical measures and test that used.

Response:

Thanks for these comments, which are the same as the comments from Reviewer 1. We have already made the modification according to these comments and described in detail above.

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) 21 May 2020

Dear AE,
Currently, this manuscript according to methodologically is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 22 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
According to Manuscript Title: Imaging characters of multiphase CT angiography in acute internal carotid artery occlusion within 6-hour time-window for thrombectomy and clinical implication, the authors considered all of the reviewer's suggestions and it is accepted.
Thanks.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes you make in the manuscript.
1- Please approve the change of title to, “Imaging Findings of Multiphase CT Angiography of Acute Internal Carotid Artery Occlusion Within 6-Hour Time-Window After Thrombectomy and its Clinical Implication”
2- In the abstract, they have mentioned intracranial thrombectomy (IAT). The abbreviation is not consistent with the phrase. Is it intra-arterial thrombectomy?
If so, please check throughout the manuscript and correct all the phrases.
3- In the objectives, “To investigate the conditions and outcomes of acute ICA occlusions at different segments after IAT.”
It seems the emphasis of the paper is on the CTA characteristics or findings while you have not mentioned CTA in the objective at all. Is their objective mentioned correctly? Please revise the objective.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 Jul 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.

Response to reviewers' comment

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Hi
Currently, this manuscript according to methodologically is acceptable.
Ans: Thanks for your comment.

Associate Editor's Comments:
Associate Editor 1:
Dear editorial
according to Manuscript Title: Imaging characters of multiphase CT angiography in acute internal carotid artery occlusion within 6-hour time-window for thrombectomy and clinical implication [Revision 1]
Manuscript ID: 102948
the authors considered all of the reviewers suggestions and it is accepted.
Ans: Thanks for your comment.

Associate Editor 2:
Dear author,
Please respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes you make in the manuscript. Please do not make any changes in the manuscript other than responding to the comments, because they will not be considered.
1-Please approve the change of title to, “Imaging Findings of Multiphase CT Angiography of Acute Internal Carotid Artery Occlusion Within 6-Hour Time-Window After Thrombectomy and its Clinical Implication”
Ans: Thanks for your comment. Sure, this new title seems to be better and we have modified in the submission system.

2-In the abstract, you have mentioned intracranial thrombectomy (IAT). The abbreviation is not consistent with the phrase. Is it intra-arterial thrombectomy? If so, please check throughout the manuscript and correct all the phrases.
Ans: Thanks for your comment. Yes, you are right, this should be intra-arterial thrombectomy (IAT). We have modified this part in the abstract. We check

throughout the whole manuscript and the rest part is correct. Thanks for your detection of our typo.

3-In the objectives, “To investigate the conditions and outcomes of acute ICA occlusions at different segments after IAT.”
It seems the emphasis of the paper is on the CTA characteristics or findings while you have not mentioned CTA in the objective at all. Is your objective mentioned correctly? Please revise the objective.
Thank you.
Ans: Thanks for your comment. We have modified our objectives in both abstract and main article section to the following statement: "To investigate the imaging findings of multiphase CTA and the clinical conditions and outcomes of acute ICA occlusions at different segments after IAT."

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 26 Jul 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 26 Jul 2020

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