Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 18 · Issue 4 · e114976

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Diagnostic Value of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Combined with Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Breast Cancer in Dense Breast Tissues

Hongfang Xu, Wei Zeng, Zehong Fu, Qing Cui

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Apr 2021	18 Sep 2021	19 Sep 2021	10.5812/iranjradiol.114976

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, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, 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 8

1 Original submission

2 comments · 25 Apr 2021 – 15 May 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 25 Apr 2021

Thanks to the authors for submitting the manuscript to IJR.
From a methodological point of view, it can be said that the study has been properly designed, implemented, and written and is almost ready for acceptance; it is enough to address the following points:
1. The Z test can be used when we know the standard deviation of the studied variable in the study population; however, sampling was used here, and you do not know the parameter, so you should have used the independent t-test.
2. In addition, if you include 95% confidence intervals in table 2 instead of the number presented in parentheses, table 3 will not be needed because it is enough to examine the overlap of the confidence intervals of the methods. If the confidence intervals do not overlap, there will be a significant difference between the two methods in terms of that index.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 15 May 2021

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor 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.

Manuscript ID: 114976
Title: Diagnostic value of digital breast tomosynthesis combined with magnetic resonance imaging for breast cancer in dense breast tissues

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
it is an original and relevant article.
high novelty.
Response: Thank you very much for your positive comment.

needs some revision on writing specially on discussion (too complex).
Response: We have revised writing of the entire manuscript especially the Discussion section according to your requirement.

it is good to see one of their interesting cases in article (DBT-MRI).
Response: We have added images of a case and related descriptions in the Results section according to your requirement.

Reviewer 3:
Thanks to the authors for submitting the manuscript to IJR.
From methodological point of view, it can be said that the study has been properly designed, implemented and written and is almost ready for acceptance; It is enough to pay attention to the following points:
1. The Z test can be used when we are aware of the standard deviation of the studied variable in the study population; but here, it used of sampling and you do not know the parameter, so you had to use the independent t-test.
Response: We are really sorry for the incorrect description due to carelessness. We actually used the t test, and have revised the description according to your valuable comment.

2. In addition, if you put 95% confidence intervals in table 2 instead of the number presented in parentheses, table 3 will not be needed; because it is enough to pay attention to the overlap of the confidence intervals of the methods, and if the overlap does not coincide, there will be a significant difference between the two methods in terms of that index.
Response: We have supplemented 95% confidence intervals in Table 2 and deleted Table 3 according to your valuable comment.

Reviewer 4:
this article needs major submission.
Response: We have thoroughly revised the manuscript according to reviewers' comments.

Associate Editor's Comments:
Associate Editor 1:
Dear authors,
Thank you for submitting your interesting study to IJR. There are several comments to improve your work, please consider the reviewers' comments before proceeding to next step.
Response: We have thoroughly revised the manuscript according to reviewers' comments.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 11 Jul 2021 – 18 Sep 2021

Referee 1 Reviewer

ACCEPT 11 Jul 2021

Thanks to the authors for editing the manuscript.
Currently, the manuscript is acceptable in terms of methodology.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 18 Sep 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.

Manuscript ID: 114976, rev [1]

Reviewers' Comments:
Reviewer 1:
Thanks from authors for editing the manuscript.
Currently, the manuscript is acceptable according to methodology.
Response: Thank you very much for your positive comment.

Reviewer 2:
the article is accepted after revision
Response: Thank you very much for your positive comment.

Reviewer 3:
This paper is ok for publication in IJR.
Response: Thank you very much for your positive comment.

Associate Editor's Comments:
Associate Editor 1:
Dear authors,
Thank you for appropriate changes in the revision.
The manuscript is accepted for final process.
Response: Thank you very much for your positive comment.

Associate Editor 2:
1-please add the manufacturer data of SPSS.
Response: We have added the required information.

2-please add full term of abbreviation ACR.
Response: We have given the full term of abbreviation ACR the first time.

3-please add full term of abbreviations in figure 1 and 2 legends.
Response: We have given the full terms of abbreviations in figure 1 and 2 legends.

4-please correct table 2 legend as: "Diagnostic indices values of five examination methods for Differentiation of malignant Breast Lesions from Benign Breast Lesions"
Response: We have made the required revision.

5-Please introduce abbreviations of table 2 in footnote.
Response: We have introduced the abbreviations of table 2 in footnote.

6-the Y axis in figure 2 is written as sensibility that is wrong. It is sensitivity. Please correct.
Response: We are really sorry for the mistake and have revised this figure.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 19 Sep 2021

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 19 Sep 2021

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