Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 1 · e106949

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Assessment of Patient-Related Operative Complexity During Partial Nephrectomy: Comparison of Two Tailored Methods for Measurement of Posterior Perinephric Fat Thickness on Preoperative CT

Na Yeon Han, Deuk Jae Sung, Min Ju Kim, Beom Jin Park, Ki Choon Sim, Seok Ho Kang

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
28 Jun 2020	30 Sep 2020	20 Feb 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.106949

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 14

1 Original submission

3 comments · 4 Jul 2020 – 12 Jul 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 4 Jul 2020

Hi
It can be said that this manuscript needs some methodological revisions:
1. In general, the purpose and method were not properly and clearly described. In addition to the agreement between the observers, did the researchers seek to compare the two methods? In this case, this issue must be stated in the title and purpose.
2. The study design is cross-sectional, and it must be revised.
3. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for patient selection must be described in detail.
4. The Methods section mentions that "Interobserver agreement between the two radiologists for PPFT, the perinephric fat stranding score, and the RENAL nephrometry score were analyzed using kappa statistics or the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)"; however, in table 1, intra-observer agreement was assessed, not inter-observer agreement! What did you mean?
5. When the dependent variable is time, Cox regression must be used; however, logistic regression was used here. Why?
6. The draft must be edited for English usage.
7. Some detailed comments are included in the manuscript draft.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 12 Jul 2020

The manuscript needs Major Revision based on the reviewers' suggestions.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 12 Jul 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major Revision.
Regards

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to Reviewers

Manuscript ID: **106949, rev [0]**

Manuscript title: **Assessment of Patient-related Operative Complexity during Partial Nephrectomy: Comparison of Two Tailored Methods for the Measurement of Posterior Perinephric Fat Thickness on Preoperative CT**

We sincerely appreciate your time and your excellent suggestions for our manuscript.

We agreed with most of the reviewer's comments and revised our manuscript in response to the comments. We have finished our revisions and are re-submitting our manuscript. The revised parts according to the reviewers' comment were highlighted, but the revised part according to English edit was not marked.

If you could kindly provide advice on any missing points, we will happily perform further revisions.

Your decision of acceptance will be a great honor.

Our responses to the reviewers' comments are as follows.

[Reviewer #1]

1. In general, the purpose and method were not properly and clearly described. In addition to the agreement between the observers, did the researchers seek to compare the two methods? In this case, this issue must be stated in the title and purpose.
   → We agree with your comments and have revised the title and purpose as per your suggestions.

2. Study design is cross-sectional and it must be revised.
   → According to your opinion, we added it in introduction and abstract.

3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria of patients selection must be written in detailed.
   → As per your opinion, we added detailed exclusion criteria.

4. In method mentioned that "Interobserver agreement between the two radiologists for PPFT, the perinephric fat stranding score, and the RENAL nephrometry score were analyzed using

kappa statistics or the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)"; But in table 1, intra-observer agreement was assessed not inter-observer! What was your mean?

→ The values mentioned in Table 1 are measured data, not correlation coefficients. To avoid confusion, the title of table 1 has been revised.

5. When the dependent variable is time it must be used of Cox regression; but here, it used of logistic regression? Why?

   → Thanks for the important comment. In the first draft, we found that the statistical method was incorrectly entered. we have revised that throughout the manuscript.

6. The draft must be edited according to english writing.

   → We received the English editing for the manuscript again, and some parts modified accordingly were marked on the manuscript.

7. Some detailed comment annexed in the manuscript draft.

[Reviewer #2]

Dear authors

Although research has already been done on the relationship between Perinephric Fat Thickness and Patient-related Operative Complexity during Partial Nephrectomy, it is a new study to compare this method with other methods, but due to its different results from other studies, more extensive studies are needed.

In the discussion section, just a study has been mentioned and there has been no comparison with other studies and the reason for the difference in results has not been determined.

➔ We agree with your comments. As per your opinion, we revised and added some references to the discussion section of the manuscript.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 15 Aug 2020 – 31 Aug 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 15 Aug 2020

Hi
Currently, some revisions have been made to the manuscript file, but it needs some further edits as follows:
1. In the abstract and the full-text Methods section: A cross-sectional study is unidirectional, and the term retrospective must be deleted.
2. As mentioned in the first review, when the dependent variable is time, Cox regression must be used; however, linear regression was used here! Why?
3. Please consult with a statistician about how to report regression analysis results, because Table 2 currently needs revision.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 29 Aug 2020

The manuscript needs minor revision considering the suggestions of the methodology reviewer.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 31 Aug 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to Reviewers

Manuscript ID: **106949, rev [1]**

Manuscript title: **Assessment of Patient-related Operative Complexity during Partial Nephrectomy: Comparison of Two Tailored Methods for the Measurement of Posterior Perinephric Fat Thickness on Preoperative CT**

The remaining issues were discussed with a statistician and some have been supplemented. But if there are still problems, we will happily perform further revisions.

I would like to add an expression of gratitude to the statisticians who consulted this paper in acknowledgement. The following statements are to be added: *The authors are grateful to Kyung Sook Yang, PhD, for provision of statistical consultation.*

Your decision of acceptance will be a great honor.

Sincerely,

Deuk Jae Sung, MD, PhD

Department of Radiology, Anam Hospital

Korea University College of Medicine

1. In abstract and full-text method: Cross-sectional study is unidirectional and retrospective must be deleted.

This study is considered a retrospective study because it included patients who had undergone nephrectomy for the past 5 years, and used data such as operation time and

pathological results obtained in the past. Also, it is considered a cross-sectional study since PPFT was evaluated for these patients at the time of the current study. Therefore, the authors thought that this study has the characteristics of both retrospective and cross-sectional study. Nevertheless, if it is judged that the expression ‘retrospective’ is inappropriate, it would be better to exclude the word ‘retrospective’.

2. As mentioned in first time review; when the dependent variable is time it must be used of Cox regression; but here, it used of linear regression! Why?

The ischemia time and operative time are dependent variables, and there are no event variables of interest in this study, so the Cox regression considering censoring is not appropriate. The operation time was also between 2 and 4 hours. Therefore, we think that there is no choice but to do multiple linear regression due to the data structure of our study.

3. Please consult with an statistician about how to report regression analysis results. Because, at present table 2 needs revision.

This is a table that summarizes the results of 16 multiple linear regression models. Among them, the left eight models included the PPFT measured by the first reviewer as a covariate, and the remaining eight models in right column included the PPFT measured by the second reviewer as a covariate. Other covariates included in the model include age, sex, body mass index, pathology, laterality, perinephric stranding and nephrometry score, and the final results obtained from each model are written in a table (only statistically significant covariates were written). Footnotes have been added to improve understanding of table 2.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 19 Sep 2020 – 27 Sep 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 19 Sep 2020

Hi
Unfortunately, the requested changes have not yet been made, and it is necessary to make the following revisions:
1. A cross-sectional study means that samples are examined only at one point in time and are not followed up, so the term retrospective or prospective should not be used in these studies.
2. Regarding the choice of regression type, it should be said that this choice is based on the dependent, event, or outcome variable. The dependent variable and the event are the same thing.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 27 Sep 2020

The manuscript needs Minor Revision considering the methodological review.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 27 Sep 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

4

Revision 3

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to Reviewers

Manuscript ID: 106949, rev [2]

Manuscript title: Assessment of Patient-related Operative Complexity during Partial Nephrectomy: Comparison of Two Tailored Methods for the Measurement of Posterior Perinephric Fat Thickness on Preoperative CT

We sincerely appreciate your time and your excellent suggestions for our manuscript. The remaining issues were discussed with a statistician and some have been supplemented. But if there are still problems, we will happily perform further revisions.

Revisions are highlighted in yellow. Your decision of acceptance will be a great honor.

Sincerely,

Deuk Jae Sung, MD, PhD

Department of Radiology, Anam Hospital

Korea University College of Medicine

Point by point response

1. Cross-sectional study means that samples are examined only at one point in time and are not followed up, so the term retrospective or prospective should not be used in these studies.

   → As per your suggestion, we revised the manuscript.

2. Regarding the choice of regression type, it should be said that this is done based on the dependent or event or outcome variable. The dependent variable or event are both

the same thing.

→ As per your suggestion, we revised ‘statistical analysis’ section and ‘table 2’.

4 Revision 3

3 comments · 3 Oct 2020 – 20 Feb 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 3 Oct 2020

From a methodological point of view, it can now be said that it is acceptable and ready for publication.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 3 Oct 2020

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 20 Feb 2021

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