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.112415
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 18(2); e112415

Peer Review Report for "Multimodal MRI Features of Medulloblastoma with Extensive Nodularity and Activated Sonic Hedgehog: A Case Report"

Author(s): Jihyun Kim, Byung Hyun Baek, Yun Young Lee, Woong Yoon, Kyung-Hwa Lee, Hee Jo Baek, Seul Kee Kim

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 Dec 2020
Revised Date: 9 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 12 Jun 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) — 1 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
1.Why didn't authors report other DSC parameters? (such as CBF, MTT)
2.Why didn't the authors use short TE metabolites in MRS such as MI, Lipid and etc? They can be markers in some tumors. This could be an interesting adjunct to MRS study of this rare case.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 3 Jan 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 20 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,

This article is accepted for printing in IJR.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Feb 2021

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 Prof. Karim Vessal, MD and Dr. Kavous Firouznia, MD, Editor-in-Chief:

Please consider for publication our revised manuscript entitled of “Multimodal MR Imaging Features of Medulloblastoma with Extensive Nodularity and Sonic Hedgehog-Activated: A Case Report”.

According to the reviewer’s recommendation, we tried to provide clear answers to all comments. Below, we provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments.

We hope that our revised manuscript will be acceptable for publication in “Iranian Journal of Radiology”.

With best regards,

Dr. Seul Kee Kim, MD
Department of Radiology
Chonnam National University Hwasun Hospital, Chonnam national university medical school
322 Seoyang-ro, Hwasun-eup, Hwasun-gun, Jeollanam-do 58128, Republic of Korea
TEL;82-61-379-7112
FAX;82-61-379-7133
E-mail; kimsk.rad@gmail.com

Point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers.

Thank you for providing us with the reviewers' valuable comments on our manuscript. According to reviewers' comments, we have made changes in our manuscript as follows.

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Reviewer 1:

1. Why didn't authors report other DSC parameters? (such as CBF, MTT)

Answer: Thank you for your comment. With DSC-perfusion MR imaging, microvascular density and neovascularization are reflected in relative cerebral blood volume (rCBV) values. Using these features, rCBV is widely used to evaluate different tumor types, predict tumor grade, and monitor tumor progression. Other DSC parameters (such as CBF and MTT), unlike rCBV which easily and simply obtains relatively measured (not absolute) data, require a more complex and time-consuming data acquisition process, and are therefore known to be relatively infrequent in the evaluation of intracranial tumors. Therefore, in our institution, only rCBV is acquired among DSC parameters in the intracranial tumor MR protocol, and, unfortunately, other parameters could not be used for evaluation.

2.Why didn't the authors use short TE metabolites in MRS such as MI, Lipid and etc?

They can be markers in some tumors. This could be an interesting adjunct to MRS study of this rare case.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We added the data of several short TE metabolites in case presentation.

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) — 7 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 5 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
Comments for the authors:
1-in lines 22 and 23, please correct: "…. World Health Organization (WHO) in classification……"
2-please abbreviate T1WI and T2WI first in line 42 not line 93.
3-line 129, please write MI instead of mI
4-in nfigure 1 legend, please correct mpa to map.
5-it is better the authors define full term of abbreviations of figure legend at the end of legend.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 6 Jun 2021

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 Prof. Karim Vessal, MD and Dr. Kavous Firouznia, MD, Editor-in-Chief:

Please consider for publication our revised manuscript entitled of “Multimodal MR Imaging Features of Medulloblastoma with Extensive Nodularity and Sonic Hedgehog-Activated: A Case Report”.

According to the reviewer’s recommendation, we tried to provide clear answers to all comments. Below, we provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments.

We hope that our revised manuscript will be acceptable for publication in “Iranian Journal of Radiology”.

With best regards,

Point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers.

Thank you for providing us with the reviewers' valuable comments on our manuscript. According to reviewer's comments, we have made changes in our manuscript as follows.

Reviewer Comments to Author:

Associate Editor 1:

1-in lines 22 and 23, please correct: "…. World Health Organization (WHO) in classification.…."

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We correct the sentence.

2-please abbreviate T1WI and T2WI first in line 42 not line 93.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We correct the sentence.

3-line 129, please write MI instead of mI

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We correct the sentence.

4-in nfigure 1 legend, please correct mpa to map.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We correct the sentence.

5-it is better the authors define full term of abbreviations of figure legend at the end of legend.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. We added the abbreviations of figure legend at the end of legend.

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) 11 Jun 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 12 Jun 2021

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