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.104475
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(4); e104475

Peer Review Report for "A Case Report of a Patient with Severe Type of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treated by Hyperbaric Oxygen: CT Dynamic Changes"

Author(s): Yi Liang, Na Fan, Xiaoling Zhong, Wenhui Fan

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 May 2020
Revised Date: 13 Jul 2020
Accepted Date: 18 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) — 11 May 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting the case report to our journal. Regarding that IJR is a radiology journal and we focus on radiologic features of disease before, during, and after treatment, I kindly ask the authors to send more sectional images of each series of CT scan. This will help us and the readers to evaluate distribution of patchy and ground glass appearance and the response to therapy.
Best

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 12 May 2020

Dear AE,
The article needs some revisions.
1) Please write the article according to the CARE Checklist.
2) Figures legends should be according to IJR format (eg. A 69-year-old man .....)
3) There is no need for the date (eg. Feb 7, 2020) in the figure legend. Please report according to the days of the infection (eg. 5 days,...)

4) Please discuss more the significance of CT scans in such cases.
Best Regards

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

22 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks to the authors for submitting this article to our journal. Based on reviewers' comments the article needs minor revision at this stage.
Thanks.

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

23 May 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.

Dear Editor and Reviewer:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewer's comment concerning our manuscript entitled " A case report of a patient with severe type of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treated by hyperbaric oxygen: CT dynamic changes"(104475). The comment is very helpful for revising and improving our paper. Revised portion are marked with highlight in the paper.

Response to the reviewer 1 comment:

1. We carefully revised and checked the full manuscript according to CARE Checklist，

including title,abstract,keywords, introduction, case presentation, discussion, footnotes, and references.

2. Figure legend has been modified in accordance with the IJR format."Chest CT images of a 69-year-old man with severe COVID-19 treated by hyperbaric oxygen." was **added.**

3. Check dates in the figure legend were **deleted**. We report according to the days of the infection as follows： the first CT on the day of disease onset, 5 days after the onset, 27 days after the onset and 8 days after the hyperbaric oxygen treatment.

In addition, some errors have also been corrected.

"the first CT on the day of disease onset showed a patchy GGO shadow in the S II segment of the upper lobe of the right lung" was **corrected** as "the first CT on the day of disease onset showed a patchy GGO shadow in the S I and S II segments of the upper lobe of the right lung" .

"5 days after the onset, reexamination of CT showed large patches of GGO shadows in the S II segment of the upper lobe of both lungs" was **corrected** as "5 days after the onset, reexamination of CT showed large patches of GGO shadows in the S I, S II and S III segments of the upper lobe of the right lung and the S I+II segment of the upper lobe of the left lung".

"38 days after the onset and 19 days after the hyperbaric oxygen treatment,

reexamination of CT showed that the consolidation density and range in both lungs were reduced" was **corrected** as"38 days after the onset and 19 days after the hyperbaric oxygen treatment, reexamination of CT showed that the consolidation density in both lungs was reduced,but the range did not change".

4. In discussion part,we add more about the significance of CT scan in case. "In this report,the patient showed small patchy GGO shadows at three lung segments in the early stage.Sixteen days after disease onset,the lesions further expanded, the CT showed the "white lung" manifestation, and the patient's hypoxia symptoms significantly aggravated. After 8 sessions of hyperbaric oxygen treatment, the CT showed that the density of the lung lesions was reduced, and fibrous cord shadows occurred. Although the lung lesions only partially resolved after hyperbaric oxygen treatment," was **added.** "After 8 sessions of hyperbaric oxygen treatment, CT of the patient reported in this article showed that the lung lesions only partially resolved, while" were **deleted.**

Response to the reviewer 2 comment:

1. We have **added six** sectional images of each series of CT scan before, during and after treatment, in order to better show distribution of patchy and ground glass appearance and the response to therapy.

If you have any further question, be free to contact us. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Wenhui FAN ,MD

Department of Radiology, General Hospital of the Yangtze River Shipping,Wuhan, Hubei Province, China .

E-mail:fanwenhui6709@163.com

Telephone:+86 027 82451207

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) 31 May 2020

Dear AE,
The revised could be acceptable for the publication.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 13 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript could be accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 11 Jul 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes they make in the manuscript.
1- Would the authors please approve changing the title to, “A Patient with a Severe Type of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treated by Hyperbaric Oxygen: CT Dynamic Changes”
2- In the case presentation, “After admission, the patient was given ceftriaxone sodium 3 g/d and abidor 0.2 g, three times/d, and continuous nasal cannula low-flow oxygen therapy.”
3- Do the authors mean, “Arbidol” with the generic name of “Umifenovir”? Please revise and correct if you agree.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 12 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.

Dear Editor:

Thank you for your letter concerning our manuscript entitled " A case report of a patient with severe type of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) treated by hyperbaric oxygen: CT dynamic changes"(104475). The suggestions are very helpful for revising and improving our paper.

1. We approve to change the title to, “A Patient with a Severe Type of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Treated by Hyperbaric Oxygen: CT Dynamic Changes”.

2. We have corrected “Arbidol”with“Umifenovir”.

If you have any further question, be free to contact us. Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Wenhui FAN ,MD

Department of Radiology, General Hospital of the Yangtze River Shipping,Wuhan, Hubei Province, China .

E-mail:fanwenhui6709@163.com

Telephone:+86 027 82451207

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) 16 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) 18 Jul 2020

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