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.113682
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 18(3); e113682

Peer Review Report for "Primary High-grade Serous Carcinoma of the Fallopian Tube as an Incidental Intraoperative Finding: A Case Report"

Author(s): Nasim Shokouhi, Sara Saeedi , Soheila Sarmadi, Behnaz Moradi, Elham Feizabad

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 8 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 5 Sep 2021
Accepted Date: 6 Sep 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) — 15 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The article introduces a 55 y/o female with chronic vaginal discharge, resistance to medical treatment, and positive family history of uterine cancer. clinical examination was normal and pelvic MRI demonstrate thick wall enhancing left fallopian tube with internal high proteinous or hemorrhagic
component. she was undergoing TAH_BSO, and surgery reveals a bulky and tumoral fallopian tube with the pathology of high-grade serous carcinoma. This article is informative and makes new points.
Sincerely yours

Maryam Rahmani: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 23 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should update references.
BR

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Apr 2021

Dear EIC,
Thanks for submitting the study to our journal. At this stage, we kindly ask the authors to update the list of references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Apr 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 reviewers

Thank for your valuable comments.

The paper’s references were updated.

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) — 11 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Article is appropriate to publish.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 26 Jun 2021

Dear EIC,
We are happy to inform the authors that the manuscript has properly changed and could be accepted and is ready to be further processed.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 30 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The parts included introduction, case presentation and conclusion should be specified in the abstract of the article.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 Sep 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 4 Sep 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 Reviewer 3:

The parts included introduction, case presentation and conclusion should be specified in the abstract of the article.

Was corrected.

Dear Associate Editor 2:

1-this part seems to be repetitive and should be corrected: “…. due to the drug (Megestrol Acetate)-resistant abnormal vaginal bleeding, her abnormal vaginal bleeding…..”

Was corrected.
2-it seems the term “”lymphovascular invasion’ is better.

Was corrected.
3-please add full term of abbreviations such as TAH, …..

Was corrected.
4-in line 89, please change “This study” to “this report”

Was corrected.
5-this sentence seems unclear or wrong: “Nulliparity, a past history of pelvic inflammatory disease accounts for some probable risk factors which include oral contraceptive use (OCP), parity, infertility, and tubal ligation (TL) (4)” please clarify or correct.

Was corrected.

6-the authors mentioned “Based on the present case study”. it seems to be written better as: “Based on review of literature for the present case ……”

Was corrected.

7-in figure 2 legend part C, “The tumor is infiltration” seems wrong. It could be written as: The tumor infiltrated …..”

Was corrected.

8-in figure 2 legend, it seems the images are related to histopathology not cytology. Please consider and correct the legend.

Was corrected.

9-please introduce the case very briefly at the beginning of figure 1 legend.

Was inserted.

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) 5 Sep 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 6 Sep 2021

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