Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 3 · e111237

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Intra-oral Ultrasonography of Young Adult Mandibular Foramen: A Reliable Method

Mojdeh Mehdizadeh, Negar Baharlouei, Hossein Taheri

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
23 Nov 2020	14 Jun 2021	19 Jun 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.111237

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 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 10
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 15
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 16
Authors' reply to reviewers 17
Reviewer and editor comments 22

1 Original submission

3 comments · 7 Dec 2020 – 28 Dec 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 7 Dec 2020

A) Since the study is cross-sectional and its purpose is to determine normal values in the population, these values must be presented separately for all important and influential variables, such as age, etc. In this case, a sample size of 50 people is not suitable.
B) The second part of the study aim also mentioned investigating the relationship with adjacent soft tissue, which was not presented in the results.
C) The methods section should be written completely and transparently to allow readers to repeat the study and achieve the same results, so the following must be added and explained:
1. Type of study
2. Sampling method and reference population
3. Demographic characteristics of the study population
4. The variables studied and their measurement methods
5. Imaging technique
6. Image interpretation
7. Ethical considerations such as the code of ethics and informed consent
D) In the statistical analysis section:
1. The assessment of normality for quantitative variables should be explained.
2. The variables analyzed using each statistical test and the purpose of each test should be stated.
3. A significance level must be specified.
4. The statistical analysis section should explain the analysis of each result presented, as in Figure 2, and vice versa.
E) Results
1. The age range of patients is limited to 19 to 28 years, which should be mentioned in the title.
2. In addition to the number, the percentage should also be expressed in the text.
3. What do you mean by probability in figure 2? How the probability value was calculated should be explained in the statistical analysis section.
4. To present the results of Table 2 in the text, the mean value of each group must be stated with a significance level.
F) Tables
1. First, the number of samples should be classified and described based on demographic characteristics such as age and sex. In addition, the mean age of the samples must be presented separately for men and women.
2. Table 2 should be presented from left to right.
3. Minimum and maximum values should be removed from Table 2 and replaced by a 95% confidence interval for the mean.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 25 Dec 2020

Dear authors;
I studied your manuscript.
There are some points and problems raised by our reviewers, as well as the following questions and problems.
Units of measurement must be mentioned.
You have mentioned: " This study was performed to evaluate the location of the mandibular foramen and its

112related adjacent soft tissue landmarks using intra-oral ultrasonography patients.": Which soft tissue landmark?
How did color Doppler help you? You must discuss it in the methods section. There are significant scientific writing problems.
"During the Doppler method, the arteries was seen with bright red, and the pulse of IAN was also diagnosed": Two parts are wrong.
Ultrasound images with and without color Doppler are needed. You must show your landmarks on them.
"Based on the results, the using ultrasonography could be a safe and reliable choice for diagnosing the stated mental and its related landmarks": What do you mean by this sentence in the conclusion?
English writing needs complete revision.

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 28 Dec 2020

Dear authors,
Your article is not acceptable in this format.
Any decision depends on your reply to the referee and on a 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.

Ms. Ref. No.: IJR- 111237

Title: Intra-oral ultrasonography of young adult mandibular foramen: a reliable method

Iranian Journal of Radiology

Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers:

The authors would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions to improve the quality of this manuscript. The manuscript has been revised following these comments and suggestions. The changes are highlighted. We hope that the present status of the manuscript satisfies the requirements for its publication in *Iranian Journal of Radiology* as an *original article.* For clarification of the contents of the revised manuscript, the point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

1. **Since the study is cross-sectional and its purpose is to determine the normal values in the population, therefore, it is necessary that these values be presented separately in terms of all important and influential variables such as age, etc .; In this case, the sample size of 50 people is not suitable.**

Thank you very much for the valuable comments. It should be noted that, the aim of this study was to "evaluate the ultrasonic imaging to locate the mandibular foramen and its relation adjacent landmarks". However, the determination of normal values was not included in this

study. Moreover, by the best of our knowledge, with the respect to your valuable comment, the determination of normal values is not defined in dentistry for these patients.

The number of sample size of this study was approved from “Statistical analyzers Professors” of our university.

2. **In the second part of the study aim, it also mentioned that the study was to investigate the relationship with adjacent soft tissue, which was not presented in the results.**

Agree. This is now revised.

3. The method section should be written in a complete and transparent way that allows readers to repeat and achieve the same results, so it is necessary to add and explain the following:

a. Type of study

Agree. Revised.

b. Sampling method and reference population.

Agree. Revised.

c. Demographic characteristics of the study population.

Agree. Revised.

(A demographic characteristics table is now added.)

d. The studied variables and their measurement method.

Agree. Revised.

g. Ethical considerations such as code of ethics and the informed consent

Agree. Revised.

(It is written on the Ethics approval section).

4. In the statistical analysis section:

a. Quantitative variables should be explained about the normality measurement.

b. It should be said that each statistical test was used between what variables and for what purpose.

c. A significant level must be specified.

d. It should be explained about each result that is presented, as in Figure 2, in the statistical analysis section, and vice versa.

Agree. Revised.

5. Results

a. The age range of patients is limited and from 19 to 28 years, which should be mentioned in the title.

Agree. Revised.

(The term young adult patients is added to the title).

b. In addition to the number, the percentage should also be expressed in the text.

Agree. Revised.

c. What is your mean from probability in figure 2? How the probability value was calculated should be explained in the statistical analysis section.

Agree. Revised.

(The term “probability” is the ratio of diagnosed patients to non-diagnosed patients, which was obtained from our analysis using SPSS program).

d. To present the results of Table in the text, it must be state the mean value of each group with a significant level.

Agree. Revised.

6. Tables

1. First, the number of samples should be classified and described based on demographic characteristics such as age and sex. In addition, it must be presented the mean age of the samples separately for men and women.

Agree. Revised.

2.Table 2 should be presented from left to right.

Agree. Revised.

3. Minimum and maximum values should be removed from Table 2 and replaced by a 95% average confidence interval.

Agree. Revised.

The authors would like to thank from reviewers for their useful comments and criticisms, which have resulted in a higher quality manuscript. The manuscript has been revised following the reviewers Comments and suggestions. The changes are highlighted. The authors believe that the present status of the manuscript satisfies the requirements for its publication as an original article.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Sincerely.

Authors of the manuscript.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 5 Feb 2021 – 6 Feb 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 5 Feb 2021

First of all, thank you for modifying the manuscript file, but you still need to do the following:
1. Edit the manuscript in terms of English grammar and writing.
2. Sample size: It is necessary to explain the statistical formula, the variable used, and the statistical assumptions in the response to the reviewer, not in the main text. In addition, it is necessary to report the study power by performing a power test.
3. Statistical analysis: It should be stated which variables each statistical test was used to examine for associations. Why were parametric tests, their nonparametric equivalents, and dependent tests used together?
4. In Table 1, for the gender variable, in addition to the percentage, the number must also be presented.
5. In Table 2, the confidence interval should include both the upper and lower limits! In addition, the mean value must be presented first, followed by the standard deviation and confidence interval.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 5 Feb 2021

Dear authors,
Please check our reviewer comments. A major revision is needed.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 6 Feb 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major 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.

Ms. Ref. No.: IJR- 111237

Title: Intra-oral ultrasonography of young adult mandibular foramen: a reliable method

Iranian Journal of Radiology

Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers:

The authors would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions to improve the quality of this manuscript. The manuscript has been revised following these comments and suggestions. The changes are highlighted. We hope that the present status of the manuscript satisfies the requirements for its publication in *Iranian Journal of Radiology* as an *original article.* For clarification of the contents of the revised manuscript, the point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

1. **Edit the manuscript in terms of English grammar and writing.**

Agree. Revised

2. **Sample size: It is necessary to explain about statistical formula, the variable that used, and statistical assumptions, in the response to reviewer not in the main text. In addition, it is necessary to report the amount of study power by performing**.

In this study the number of patients was selected according the following formula:

$$n=\frac{z^2 p(1-p)}{d^2}$$

Where, the confidential coefficient (z) was 1.96 and p was 5%. In addition, d was 0.1.

Therefore, the number of studied patients was obtained at least 96. So, we studied the both sides (left and right sides which are shown in Table 2) of 50 patients.

Thus, we studied 100 mandibular cases in our study.

3. **Statistical analysis: It should be written that each statistical test was used to examine the associations of what variables. Why were used of parametric, equivalent non-parametric and dependent tests together?**

Agree. Revised. The Parametric paired samples and independent T-test were applied for the mean values and also standard deviations. In this study, the non-parametric and dependent tests were not used.

4. **In Table 1, for the gender variable, in addition to the percentage, the number must also be presented. In Table 2, the confidence interval should include two upper and lower limit numbers! In addition, firstly must be presented mean value and then standard deviation and confidence interval are provided.**

Agree. Revised.

The authors would like to thank from reviewers for their useful comments and criticisms, which have resulted in a higher quality manuscript. The manuscript has been revised following the reviewers Comments and suggestions. The changes are highlighted. The authors believe that the present status of the manuscript satisfies the requirements for its publication as an original article.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Sincerely.

Authors of the manuscript.

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 2 Apr 2021 – 6 Jun 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 2 Apr 2021

Thanks to the dear authors for responding to the questions and appropriately addressing the comments in the manuscript. Currently, this draft is acceptable from a methodological standpoint.

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 9 Apr 2021

Dear authors,
Thank you for considering and addressing our reviewers' points.
Your manuscript is now acceptable for publication in IJr.
Best regards,

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 6 Jun 2021

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.

Ms. Ref. No.: IJR- 111237

Title: Intra-oral ultrasonography of young adult mandibular foramen: a reliable method

Iranian Journal of Radiology

Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers:

The authors would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief, and Reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions to improve the quality of this manuscript. The manuscript has been revised following these comments and suggestions. We hope that the present status of the manuscript satisfies the requirements for its publication in *Iranian Journal of Radiology* as an *original article.* For clarification of the contents of the revised manuscript, the point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments are presented below.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Thanks from dear authors for responding to the questions and so, appropriately applying comments in the manuscript. Currently, this draft is acceptable according to methodology points.

Thank you very much for your worthwhile comment.

Reviewer 2:

This paper is ok.

Thank you very much for your advantageous comments.

~~~~~~~~~~

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear authors,

Thank you for considering and fulfilling our reviewers points.

Your manuscript is now acceptable to be published in IJr.

Best regards,

Thank you very much for your valuable comments.

Associate Editor 2:

1-please add objective part to abstract and main paper according to journal format.

Agree, Revised

2-following sentence does not have verb: “Moreover, an Alpinion (Seoul, South Korea) ultrasound system for diagnosing the mandibular foramen, and also the distance from different relative landmarks”

Agree, Revised
~~~~~~~~~~

3-in line 44, please correct: “….and it seems to be a good ….” Agree, Revised

4-in line 46, please change image accuracy to imaging accuracy. In this line, please write injection of

Agree, Revised

5-line 56, relative is better to be in relation. Agree, Revised

6-please correct: “occupy” in line to “play” line 61. Agree, Revised

7-line 68, patents is patients Agree, Revised

8-please define full terfm of abbreviations for the first time, Agree, Revised

9-line 75, please delete the mentioned Agree, Revised

10-please correct: Figure 1 illustrates Agree, Revised

11-please write the correct and complete manufacturer data of SPSS [version 22 I think belongs to IBM Inc. located in Armonk not Chicago] Agree, Revised

12-in this sentence: “Furthermore, the probability of mandibular diagnosing was obtained according to statistical analysis which was done using SPSS program.”: Agree, Revised

I-please delete: “was obtained according to statistical analysis which was done using SPSS program”

Agree. This sentence is deleted.

II-what is meaning of “mandibular diagnosing ” it is unclearf. Please clarify. Agree. This sentence is deleted

13-this sentence is unclear: “This study was done to measure the mandibular foramina to its related soft and hard landmarks distances using ultrasonography method” please consult with an expert editor. Agree, Revised

14-please correct: In all patients [line 107] Agree, Revised

15-in lines 111 and 112, please correct: in left and right sides Agree, Revised

16-following sentence is unclear: “Also, there was found two mandibular foramina in right, and one in the left side for males, while it was two on the right for females.” Agree, Revised

17-inn line 115, please correct: “mandibular foramen distance to anterior border” Agree, Revised

18-line 131, please delete patients Agree, Revised

19-in line 133, please change diagnosing to determination. [this could be applied in other parts of paper too, this act seems to be more “determination” rather “diagnosis”] Agree, Revised

20-line 134, please correct: mandibular ramus, internal pterygoid and masseter muscles Agree, Revised

21-line 155: had not is better did not have Agree, Revised

22-please delete title Conclusion and begin paragraph with in conclusion. Agree, Revised

23-please correct the legend of fig 2 as: “Figure 2. Probability of mandibular foramina determination with (blue) and without (red) Doppler method” Agree, Revised

24-please delete the studied in table 1 legend. Agree, Revised

25-in table 2 legend, distance should be the first word Agree, Revised

Sincerely yours,

The authors of this manuscript

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 19 Jun 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 19 Jun 2021

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