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.103595
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(4); e103595

Peer Review Report for "High-Resolution Three Dimensional MRI Findings After Plugging Surgery for Superior Semicircular Canal Dehiscence: A Case Report"

Author(s): Ji Ye Lee, Ra Gyoung Yoon, Hyun Joon Shim

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 23 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 23 Aug 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) — 16 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
About this manuscript must be said that it is a case report presentation and it must be written according to 2013 CARE Checklist.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 24 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
Based on this study and only one case, we can not recommend that 3d FLAIR MRI of SSCD cases is suitable for the evaluation of persistent symptoms after revision surgery which is the conclusion of the study and it needs a number of cases and comparison with CT scan images. In addition, the study has not cirteria of a case report.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 30 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
The article is good for publishing in IJR, but it should be emphasized that the usefulness of this method must be further evaluated by a cross sectional study with more patients.
Thanks.

Leila Aghaghazvini: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 8 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The article was reviewed by 3 reviewers and needs major revision.
With best regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 12 May 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.

June 16, 2020

Dear Editor-in-chief,

Dear Dr. Kavous Firouznia

I am very delighted for the highly valuable comments on our manuscript entitled, “High-resolution 3D MRI findings after Plugging for Superior Semicircular Canal Dehiscence: A Case report” (103595). We deeply appreciate your favorable consideration of our work. We have made a careful revision of our manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments and provided point-by-point responses to the comments.

We hope that our revised manuscript will now be suitable for publication in the *Iranian Journal of Radiology*.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Ra Gyoung Yoon, MD PhD

Department of Radiology, Nowon Eulji University Hospital, Eulji University

Seoul, 01830, Republic of Korea

E-mail: yoonrg@gmail.com

Specific responses to the comments of the reviewers

Reviewer #1

Q) The article is good for publishing in IJR, but it should be emphasized that the usefulness of this method must be further evaluated by a cross sectional study with more patients.

→ A) We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. I agree that cross sectional original research can claim more firm conclusion and reliable suggestion. Due to the lack of case numbers to make the original article, our intension of this case report was to provide clinically applicable information about high resolution 3D MRI sequences along with Pöschl plane reconstruction for SSCD, which is commonly used in temporal bone CT protocol. Accordingly, we have made some changes in the title, abstract and discussion section to make it more suitable for the case report rather than the original article as you mentioned.

Reviewer #2

Q) Based on this study and only one case, we can not recommend that 3d FLAIR MRI of SSCD cases is suitable for evaluation of persistent symptoms after revision surgery which is the conclusion of the study and it needs number of cases and comparison with CT scan images.

In addition, the study has not cirteria of a case report.

→ A) We appreciate this comment and agree with your comment. As the reviewer pointed out, future prospective or retrospective original research might be necessary to confirm the benefit of these sequences with Pöschl plane reconstruction and comparison with CT scan. However, the purpose of this case report was to share with other radiologists regarding the clinical possibility of obtaining high resolution 3D MRI sequences, not limited to 3D FLAIR, but also 3D T2WI and Pöschl plane reconstruction when radiologists perform MRI to assess postoperative SSCD patients. Accordingly, we have made some changes in the contents

which cannot be concluded by our case report alone to make it more suitable for the case report rather than the original article as you mentioned, and modified our manuscript according to the case report criteria of the Iranian journal of radiology.

Reviewer #3

Q) About this manuscript must be said that it is a case report presentation and it must be written according to 2013 CARE Checklist.

→ A) Thank you for your comment. We agree with your comment and, accordingly, we have checked our manuscript whether it follows 2013 CARE checklist, and attached a CARE checklist file.

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 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
At present, this draft was written according to 2013 CARE guideline and it is acceptable according to methodologically.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 6 Jul 2020

Dear AE,
I think most of problems of the article are revised according to reviewers' points and so publishing of the article has no problem.
Thanks.

Leila Aghaghazvini: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 9 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
Follow review the article by two reviewers , it could be accepted.
With best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 23 Aug 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 23 Aug 2020

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