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.109766
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 18(2); e109766

Peer Review Report for "Clinical Presentations and Usefulness of ^{99m}Tchnetium-Ethylene-Dicysteine (^{99m}Tc-EC) Renal Scintigraphy in Estimation of Thoracic Kidney Function in Children"

Author(s): Hanna Szymanik-Grzelak, Krzysztof Toth, Przemysław Bombiński, Agnieszka Turczyn, Małgorzata Pańczyk-Tomaszewska

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	27 Sep 2020
Revised Date:	22 Dec 2020
Accepted Date:	15 Mar 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) — 3 Oct 2020

Dear AE,
This study is a case series report, and so, it must be written according to 2013 CARE checklist.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 6 Nov 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript entitled "Clinical presentation and usefulness of 99mTchnetium-Ethylenedicysteine
(99mTc-EC) renoscintygraphy in the evaluation of the function of thoracic kidney in Children " seems to be a good review with some educational points. However, some modifications may be necessary as suggest for the authors:
1. Regarding the chosen title with the prominent role of this type of radionuclide scan(99m Tc-EC), there is no enough explanation about its characteristics and details including

radiation dose, resolution, cost, differences, or benefits compared to other scans such as MAG-3 or DTPA scan, etc.

2. Please use more familiar medical terminology for example use mediastinal shift or displacement instead of “dislocation “ at line 85 as well as thoracic instead of “thoracic” at line 36.

3. Chest X-ray in an upright position is usually performed in the posteroanterior direction. Therefore at line 146 AP probably must be changed to PA.

4. Revise the whole manuscript for other subtle mistakes or simplifications for example applying USG instead of Ultrasound or Ultrasonography that must be clearly defined before using the abbreviation.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 7 Nov 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:

First, we thank you very much for your email of 07 of November 2020. We appreciate the Reviewers' careful reading of our manuscript entitled “Clinical presentation and usefulness of ^{99m}Tchnetium-Ethylene-dicysteine (^{99m}Tc-EC) renoscintygraphy in evaluation of the function of thoracic kidney in children”.

Enclosed please find our responses to the Editors’ and the Reviewers' comments.
We appreciate your assistance with the resubmission of our manuscript and would be happy to answer any remaining questions.

Sincerely yours,

Hanna Szymanik-Grzelak
Krzysztof Toth
Przemysław Bombiński
Agnieszka Turczyn
Małgorzata Pańczyk-Tomaszewska

Reviewer 1
Hi

This study is a case series report, and so, it must be written according to 2013 CARE checklist.

RESPONSE. We thank the Reviewer for this valuable comment. We attached CARE CHECKLIST 2013 below.

Associate Editor 1:

1.Regarding to the chosen title with prominent role of this type of radionuclide scan(99m Tc-EC) , there is no enough explanation about it's characteristics and details including radiation dose ,resolution , cost ,differences or benefits compared to other scans such as MAG-3 or DTPA scan,etc.

RESPONSE: We thank the Reviewer for this comment. We added necessary information about 99m Tc-EC in the revised manuscript.

2. Please use more familiar medical terminology for example use mediastinal shift or displacement instead of "dislocation " at line 85 as well as thoracic instead of "thoracis" at line 36.

RESPONSE: We thank the Reviewer for this comment and we apologise for not being clear. We corrected mentioned sentences in the revised manuscript

3.Chest X-ray in up right position is usually performed at posteroanterior direction .Therefore at line 146 AP probably must be changed to PA.

RESPONSE: We thank the Reviewer for this comment and we apologise for not being clear. We corrected mentioned mistake in the revised manuscript.

4.Revise whole manuscript for other subtle mistakes or simplifications for example applying USG instead of Ultrasound or Ultrasonography that must be clearly defined before using abbreviation.

RESONSE: We thank the Reviewer for this comment We corrected mentioned mistakes in the revised manuscript.

Topic	Item	Checklist item description	Reported on page
Title	**1**	The words “case report” should be in the title along with what is of greatest interest in this case	P3(2-4)
Key Words	**2**	The key elements of this case in 2 to 5 key words	P4(26-27)
Abstract	**3a**	Introduction—What is unique about this case? What does it add to the medical literature?	P3(8-10)
	3b	The main symptoms of the patient and the important clinical findings	P3(12-13)
	3c	The main diagnoses, therapeutics interventions, and outcomes	P3(15-20)
	3d	Conclusion—What are the main “take-away” lessons from this case?	P3(22-25)
Introduction	**4**	Brief background summary of this case referencing the relevant medical literature	P4(30-50)
Patient Information	**5a**	Demographic information (such as age, gender, ethnicity, occupation)	P5(52-54;72),P6(84),P7(102)
	5b	Main symptoms of the patient (his or her chief complaints)	P5(72-74),P6(88-90), P7(104-105)
	5c	Medical, family, and psychosocial history including co-morbidities, and relevant genetic information	N/A
	5d	Relevant past interventions and their outcomes	N/A
Clinical Findings	**6**	Describe the relevant physical examination (PE) findings	P5(73-74), P6(88-90),P7(104-105)
Timeline	**7**	Depict important milestones related to your diagnoses and interventions (table or figure)	N/A
Diagnostic Assessment	**8a**	Diagnostic methods (such as PE, laboratory testing, imaging, questionnaires)	P5(52-57;73-74),P6(75-80;84-88,95-98)P7(102-104,106-110)
	8b	Diagnostic challenges (such as financial, language, or cultural)	P6(84-87),P7(102)
	8c	Diagnostic reasoning including other diagnoses considered	P4(41-42)
	8d	Prognostic characteristics (such as staging in oncology) where applicable	N/A
Therapeutic Intervention	**9a**	Types of intervention (such as pharmacologic, surgical, preventive, self-care)	P6(90-94), P7(111)
	9b	Administration of intervention (such as dosage, strength, duration)	P7(111)
	9c	Changes in intervention (with rationale)	P6(93-94)
Follow-up and Outcomes	**10a**	Clinician-assessed outcomes and when appropriate patient-assessed outcomes	P7(110-111)
	10b	Important follow-up test results	P5(73-74),P6(81-82),P7(110-111)
	10c	Intervention adherence and tolerability (How was this assessed?)	N/A
	10d	Adverse and unanticipated events	N/A

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) — 5 Dec 2020

Dear AE,
Currently, this manuscript is acceptable according to methodology view point.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 7 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
There are appropriate changes at manuscript but few problems still seen:
1. The phrase" case report" must be included in the title according to recommended CARE checklist
2. There is no explanation about the radiation dose of administered radiopharmacy (EC) and comparison with other applied routine media (MAG3,…)which must be answered as requested at previous review as well as other items including cost & resolution .
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 8 Dec 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:

We thank you very much for your email of 08 of December 2020. We appreciate the Reviewers' careful reading of our manuscript entitled “Clinical presentation and usefulness of ^{99m}Tchnetium-Ethylene-dicysteine (^{99m}Tc-EC) renoscintygraphy in evaluation of the function of thoracic kidney in children”.

Enclosed please find our responses to the Editors’ and the Reviewers' comments.
We appreciate your assistance with the resubmission of our manuscript and would be happy to answer any remaining questions.

Sincerely yours,

Hanna Szymanik-Grzelak
Krzysztof Toth
Przemysław Bombiński
Agnieszka Turczyn
Małgorzata Pańczyk-Tomaszewska

Associate Editor 1:

1. There are appropriate changes at manuscript but few problems still seen:
There is no explanation about radiation dose of administered radio pharmacy (EC) and comparison with other applied routine media (MAG3,…)which must be answered as requested at previous review as well as other items including cost & resolution .

RESPONSE: We thank the Reviewer for this comment. We added information what You have asked for in the revised manuscript. According to data from Polish distributor, the average costs of one labeling viol for scintigraphic tests present appropriately as follows: 62 Euro for MAG-3 and 53 Euro for EC.

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) 25 Dec 2020

Dear EIC,
Thanks to dear authors for their clear and complete response . Regarding the last revision of the manuscript with ID 109766,it is now ready for publishing at IJR.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 15 Mar 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 15 Mar 2021

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