Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 4 · e113845

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Which Modality Should Be Integrated to Increase the Diagnostic Efficiency of BI-RADS 0, 3, and 4 Lesions? Ultrasonography or Digital Breast Tomosynthesis?

Zeynep Fatma Arslan, Aysegul Altunkeser, Nergis Aksoy, Muslu Kazım Korez, Ethem Omeroglu

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
16 Feb 2021	4 Sep 2021	5 Sep 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.113845

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, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

3 comments · 2 Mar 2021 – 13 Mar 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Mar 2021

At present, the results tables have not been added to the manuscript. All parts of the manuscript must be organized according to IJR guidelines.

Referee 2 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 4 Mar 2021

For the study entitled "Which modality should we add to increase the diagnostic efficiency in BI-RADS 0, 3 and 4 Lesions? Ultrasonography or Digital Breast Tomosynthesis?", the tables should be uploaded before a decision is made. Also, please add the figure legends and mark the locations of the figures in the results.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 13 Mar 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs 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.

Author's response to review

Which modality should we add to increase the diagnostic efficiency in BI-RADS 0, 3 and 4 Lesions? Ultrasonography or Digital Breast Tomosynthesis?

Iran J Radiol | ID: 113845, rev [0]

Version: 1 Date: 22 March 2021

Author's response to review: see over

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

At present, tables of results not added in the manuscript. All parts of manuscript must be ordered in terms of IJR guidelines.

The corrections were made in the light of IJR guidelines and corrections were highlighted as yellow.

Reviewer 2:

About the study entitled: "Which modality should we add to increase the diagnostic efficiency in BI-RADS 0, 3 and 4 Lesions? Ultrasonography or Digital Breast Tomosynthesis?", the tables should be uploaded before decision making. Also please add the figure legends and mark the location of figures in the result.

Tables were added to the results section. Location of figures were labeled in the result.

We did the revisions that you suggested. I believe my manuscript is more valuable for publication in the journal in the light of advices of you.

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 23 Apr 2021 – 22 Aug 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer — ACCEPT — 23 Apr 2021

Thanks to the dear authors for addressing the comments in the manuscript.
At present, this submission is acceptable in terms of methodology and is ready for publication in the IJR.

Referee 2 Reviewer — ACCEPT — 6 May 2021

The study is now suitable for publication in IJR.

Editor-in-Chief — MINOR REVISION — 22 Aug 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor 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.

Author's response to review

Which modality should we add to increase the diagnostic efficiency in BI-RADS 0, 3 and 4 Lesions? Ultrasonography or Digital Breast Tomosynthesis?

Iran J Radiol | ID: 113845, rev [2]

Version: 2 Date: 22. 08. 2021

Author's response to review: see over

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The study is now suitable for publication in IJR.

Reviewer 2:

Thanks from dear authors for applying comments in the manuscript.

At present, this submission is acceptable according to methodology; and it is ready for publication in the IJR.

Reviewer 3:

This paper is ok.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

Dear authors,

Thank you for proper changes you made after reviewers' comments. The manuscript could now be accepted and is ready for final process.

Associate Editor 2:

1-please add the full term of abbreviations for the first time [in abstract and full paper separately] such as MG, PPV,NPV, ROC ….. In addition please add the full term of abbreviation only one time and don’t repeat them [BIRADS is introduced more than one time]

MG is corrected as DM in paper and abstract separately. Full term of the PPV and NPV is “positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV), ROC(Receiver operating characteristic)” add in to the paper (page 4 line 102 and 107).

2-in line 58, please change 120 to One hundred twenty. Please follow this point in all paper.

120 is changed to one hundred twenty (page 2 line 60).

3-lines 59 and 60, please correct: “Patients with typical benign findings [BI-RADS scores of 1 and 2] and typical malignant findings [BI-RADS score of 5] were excluded from the study”

Page 2 lines 59 is corrected as “Patients with typical benign findings [BI-RADS scores of 1 and 2] and typical malignant findings [BI-RADS score of 5] were excluded from the study”

4-sentences in lines 75-78 seem to be unclear. I recommend these corrections:

The sentences in lines 75-78 is edited as “Subsequently, patients were sonographically examined by using commercial USG device of Logiq 7 USG device (General Electrics) with a 10–14 MHz linear probe. On USG examination, patients were lying in supine position and breast scan for lesion in both radial and axial planes were accomplished.”

5-in line 83, please correct: “.. was categorized as a, b, c and d on MG”.

Line 85 is edited as “.. was categorized as a, b, c and d on DM”.

6-in line 94, please change “analyzes” to “analyses”.

Grammar mistake was edited as “analyses”.

7-in line 113, please correct malign to malignant. please apply in all paper.

The “malign” is changed to “malignant” in the entire paper. (Eighteen changes has been made).

8-in line 137 and 222, please correct dens to dense

The “dens” is changed to “dense” in the entire paper. (Nine changes has been made).

9-the paper needs a serious editing. Many parts seem wrong. Please check the paper with an expert editor.

The paper edited with a help of editing company.

10-this sentence seems unclear: “To can not downgraded BI-RADS 3 to 2 leads to increased recall rate”

The sentence edited as “Failure to reduce BI-RADS from 3 to 2 properly, leads to increase recall rate.”(page 6 line 188).

11-indeterminent seems wrong. Please correct.

“indeterminent” is changed as “indeterminate”

12-this is unclear: “In another recent study similar study”

“In another recent study similar study” is corrected as “In another study”

13-in table 1, Site of lesions should be Side of lesions

In table 1, Site of lesions was corrected.

14-in table 1, what is the meaning of pattern? It seems to be density pattern

The pattern is correted as “Breast Density”, and “1,2,3,4” edited as “a,b,c,d”. They reflects the breast parenchyma density pattern (Table 1).

15-in table 1, hiperplazi is wrong. It is hyperplasia

“hiperplazi” is edited as “hyperplasia” (Table 1).

16-what is the aeaning of Multimodality benign in table 1? Is it a pathology type?

The patients who did not underwent biopsy, they accepted as multimodaliter benign during 2 years short term follow ups (page 3 line 93) was identified within the materials and method section.

17-in table 1, lenf is wrong. Lymph seems correct.

“lenf” is edited as “lymph” (Table 1).

18-sclerosant adenosis in table 1 seems to be sclerosing adenosis.

Edited.

19-please introduce all abbreviations in tables as footnote; for example DCIS in table 1.

“SD: Standard Deviation, DCIS: Ductal carcinoma in situ, IDC: Invasive ductal carcinoma” was added as footnote within the table 1.

20-in table 4, it is better the authors mention dense instead of density.

“density” is edited as “dense” (Table 1).

21-in table 4, the authors mentioned Statistical Diagnostic Measures. It seems they mean diagnostic indices. If yes, please correct.

“Statistical Diagnostic Measures” is edited as “Diagnostic indices” (Table 4).

22-please add sequential numbers to titles and subtitles: 1-background. 2-objectives. 3-patients and methods. 3-1-Image acquisition. ……

The sequential numbers to titles and subtitles was added.

We did the revisions that you suggested. I believe my manuscript is more valuable for publication in the journal in the light of advices of you.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 5 Sep 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 5 Sep 2021

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