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.108099
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 18(1); e108099

Peer Review Report for "Quantitative Evaluation of Pubic Symphysis in Late Pregnancy Using T2* Mapping"

Author(s): Xia Zhang, Tao Gong, Shuhui Yuan, Guangbin Wang

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Aug 2020
Revised Date: 6 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 20 Feb 2021

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 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
This is a well structured and valuable study and can be accepted for publication in IJR.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 14 Aug 2020

Daer AE,
About this manuscript can be said that it designed, implemented and and analysed appropriately; but it needs some revisions to be done by the authors as follows:
1. The design of this study is case-control and must be added in abstract and full-text method. Moreover, must be added the inclusion and exclusion criteria of each group, their target population and target population.
2. In abstract method section, to be written "T2 * values were analyzed and compared among the three groups using analysis of covariance ." but, in full-text method, only mentioned that it used of analysis of variance.
3. About correlation coefficient:
3.1. The correlation coefficient must be written by r.
3.2. Correlation coefficient of Pearson can be measured only linear correlation not all type

such as non-linear correlation; therefore, when it value to be zero must be mentioned that there is no linear correlation; but when its value to be non-zero and p-value isn't significant must be written there isn't significant linear correlation.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 14 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting this interesting study to our journal. As the authors will see the comments of our reviewers, the manuscript needs minor revision before final consideration for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 15 Aug 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

We would like to thank all reviewers for their thoughtful review of this manuscript. The issues they raised are very important and helpful for improving the manuscript, and we have revised accordingly in this new version of the paper. We respond below in detail to each of the reviewer's comments, and we are willing to finish the revised version including any further suggestion that the reviewers may have.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Guangbin Wang

Reviewer 1

1) The design of this study is case-control and must be added in abstract and full-text method. Moreover, must be added the inclusion and exclusion criteria of each group, their target population and target population.

Answer: The reviewer is right that this is a case-control study, and we have added this into abstract and full-text method, as shown in the manuscript marked in red.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria was modified as follows: Subjects enrolled in this study were all Han Chinese, the inclusion criteria was as follows: 1) healthy nulliparous women at child-bearing age without any injure to the pelvis; 2) healthy first- and second-pregnant women at late pregnancy period begin at 28 weeks until birth (usually between 37 and 42 weeks of pregnancy), and none of the subjects complained of pubic pain during their pregnancies. We exclude the subjects who could not endure the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) examination because of claustrophobia or other reasons; the MRI data with too much artifact is also abandoned.

*2) In abstract method section, to be written "T2 * values were analyzed and compared among the three groups using analysis of covariance ." but, in full-text method, only mentioned that it used of analysis of variance.*

Answer: Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in this study, the analysis of covariance mentioned in the abstract was a spelling mistake. Thanks for your reminder, and we have corrected it.

3) About correlation coefficient:

3.1. The correlation coefficient must be written by r.

Answer: The correlation coefficient was modified and written by *r* in this manuscript.

3.2. Correlation coefficient of Pearson can be measured only linear correlation not all type such as non-linear correlation; therefore, when it value to be zero must be mentioned that there is not linear correlation; but when its value to be non-zero and p-value isn't significant must be written there isn't significant linear correlation.

Answer: Only linear correlation was measured in this study, we have modified the *correlation* results to *linear correlation*, as shown in the manuscript marked in red.

Reviewer 2

This is a well structured and valuable study and can be accepted for publication in IJR.

Answer: Thank you very much for your affirmation and approval to our works.

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) — 10 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
At present, all proposed comments applied properly and it is acceptable according to methodology.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 4 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks for the revision of manuscript. This study could be accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 19 Feb 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 20 Feb 2021

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