Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 19 · Issue 2 · e121918

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of Radiographers' Experience in Mammography: An Explanatory Study

Salman Albeshan, Yazeed Alashban, Nasser Shubayr, Arwa Alkhudairy, Fatma Eliraqi

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
27 Dec 2021	15 Jun 2022	19 Jun 2022	10.5812/iranjradiol-121918

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** Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 11
Authors' reply to reviewers 12
Reviewer and editor comments 14
5 **Revision 4** Editor-in-Chief 15
Authors' reply to reviewers 16
Reviewer and editor comments 18

1 Original submission

1 comment · 9 Feb 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Feb 2022

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.

Reviewers Comments	Respond
Q1: In the design of the questionnaire section, it should be explained about the names of the four main dimensions, the number of questions in each section, the minimum and maximum scores, and the meaning and concept of the score of each section.	**Reply**: Explanation about the names of the four main dimensions, the number of questions in each section were added. Please see the method section. Changes were highlighted in yellow. In terms of the minimum and maximum scores, the meaning and concept of the score of each section, we would like to explain the following. There are no minimum and maximum score in this survey we are not intending to measure participant total knowledge. Also, the design of some questions does not allow for summation (multiple choice question). For scale questions, there is no reference in the literature about the perfect/acceptable knowledge for image quality or image evolution system. Instead, we have count how many of them the participant recognise. We hope this study will open the door for future research in this area. Please see page 2-3, lines numbers: 37-45
Q2: It is necessary to indicate the value of the indicators of validity and repeatability of the questionnaire.	**Reply:** Thank you for highlighting this point. From statistical point of view, validity, and repeatability for questions 9-10 were performed as they were constructed as a Likert scale. In addition, validity and repeatability for the questionnaire were carried out. Please see the method section. We have added a sub section named (Instrument Validity). Please see the results section. Please see page 4-5, lines numbers: 75-103
Q3: The variables and the measurement method should be fully explained in a separate section of method.	**Reply** :Please see the instrument validity section in the results section. Please see page 4-5, lines numbers: 75-103

Q4: It should be described in the section as a statistical analysis about the descriptive statistical indicators and analytical tests that used and presented in the results section. Each finding that presented in the results section, it should be described in the Materials and Methods section.	**Reply** :A statistical analysis section was added. Please see page 3, lines numbers: 58-71
Q5: Why Cronbach's alpha results and correlation coefficient presented together in one table? These indicators measure different indexes. The interpretation of their results in the text of the results is also ambiguous.	**Reply:** Thank you for these constructive comments. We did re-organize the writing in the results subsections and incorporated the alpha results below the related section. Please see the highlighted in yellow paragraphs. Please see page 6, lines numbers: 115-122 Please see page 7, lines numbers: 134-137
Q6: There is ambiguity about some results and figures; because no explanation was given in the method section.	**Reply:** A detailed explanation for each survey section and question were added in the methods (highlighted in yellow). Moreover, we also organised the results to make this section fairly consistent. We have added one more illustration (figures 3 A and B.) Please see page 9-10, lines numbers: 154-165
Q7: Regarding the importance of “conflict of interest” clarification, corresponding author should fill the “ICMJ form” form and upload in the submission process. (The form exists in “conflict of interest” section of the	**Reply** :Completed and submitted.
Q8: Please clarify the financial resource and mention the number grant.	**Reply** : Completed and submitted. Please see page 14, lines numbers: 257-259

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

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.

Reviewers Comments	Respond
Q1: In the design of the questionnaire section, it should be explained about the names of the four main dimensions, the number of questions in each section, the minimum and maximum scores, and the meaning and concept of the score of each section.	**Reply**: Explanation about the names of the four main dimensions, the number of questions in each section were added. Please see the method section. Changes were highlighted in yellow. In terms of the minimum and maximum scores, the meaning and concept of the score of each section, we would like to explain the following. There are no minimum and maximum score in this survey we are not intending to measure participant total knowledge. Also, the design of some questions does not allow for summation (multiple choice question). For scale questions, there is no reference in the literature about the perfect/acceptable knowledge for image quality or image evolution system. Instead, we have count how many of them the participant recognise. We hope this study will open the door for future research in this area. Please see page 2-3, lines numbers: 37-45
Q2: It is necessary to indicate the value of the indicators of validity and repeatability of the questionnaire.	**Reply:** Thank you for highlighting this point. From statistical point of view, validity, and repeatability for questions 9-10 were performed as they were constructed as a Likert scale. In addition, validity and repeatability for the questionnaire were carried out. Please see the method section. We have added a sub section named (Instrument Validity). Please see the results section. Please see page 4-5, lines numbers: 75-103
Q3: The variables and the measurement method should be fully explained in a separate section of method.	**Reply** :Please see the instrument validity section in the results section. Please see page 4-5, lines numbers: 75-103

Q4: It should be described in the section as a statistical analysis about the descriptive statistical indicators and analytical tests that used and presented in the results section. Each finding that presented in the results section, it should be described in the Materials and Methods section.	**Reply** :A statistical analysis section was added. Please see page 3, lines numbers: 58-71
Q5: Why Cronbach's alpha results and correlation coefficient presented together in one table? These indicators measure different indexes. The interpretation of their results in the text of the results is also ambiguous.	**Reply:** Thank you for these constructive comments. We did re-organize the writing in the results subsections and incorporated the alpha results below the related section. Please see the highlighted in yellow paragraphs. Please see page 6, lines numbers: 115-122 Please see page 7, lines numbers: 134-137
Q6: There is ambiguity about some results and figures; because no explanation was given in the method section.	**Reply:** A detailed explanation for each survey section and question were added in the methods (highlighted in yellow). Moreover, we also organised the results to make this section fairly consistent. We have added one more illustration (figures 3 A and B.) Please see page 9-10, lines numbers: 154-165
Q7: Regarding the importance of “conflict of interest” clarification, corresponding author should fill the “ICMJ form” form and upload in the submission process. (The form exists in “conflict of interest” section of the	**Reply** :Completed and submitted.
Q8: Please clarify the financial resource and mention the number grant.	**Reply** : Completed and submitted. Please see page 14, lines numbers: 257-259

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 17 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 17 Apr 2022

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.

6-5-2022

Dear Editor in Chief,
Iranian Journal of Radiology

We are grateful to the editors and reviewers for their time and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have implemented their comments and suggestions and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the initial version of the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. Below, we also provide a point-by-point response explaining how we have addressed each of the editors or reviewers' comments. We look forward to the outcome of your assessment.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of the co-authors
Dr. S.M.

Reviewers' Comments	Respond
1. Figure 2 there isn't in the article. Please add it.	Thank you for pointing this out. As requested, we have added figure 2. Please see page 8.
2. Figure 3. b is incorrectly legend named. (you write figure 2. b)	Thank you for raising this point. We have corrected this spelling mistake. Please see page 11.
3. Upload each of the figures separately.	We have uploaded all figures separately for your consideration.
Associate Editor Comments	
1. please add background to abstract. Please add objective part to paper.	Thank you for bringing this point to our attention. Please see the background section in the abstract (page 1) and lines (45-47) page 2.
2. institution's profile seems wrong [profile of institution].	We have reviewed authors affiliation and profiles.
3. Please change "to elevate practice …." to "to improve practice ….."	Thank you for pointing this out. As requested, we have changed the word elevate to improve. Please see highlighted word in lines 255 (page 14) and 280 (page 15).
4. the authors can change advancements to advances in line 14.	Thank you for pointing this out. Please see highlighted word in line 38.
5. please add numbers to titles and sub-titles.	Headings and subheadings were numbered.
6. in line 43, what is the meaning of 4 here: "The other is regarding 4 the image quality evaluation systems"	It means the imaging evaluations tool including PGMI (Perfect, Good, Moderate, Inadequate), EAR (Excellent, Acceptable, Repeat), EUROPEAN (European guidelines on quality criteria for diagnostic radiographic images) and ACR. We changed the wording, please see lines 69-17 page 3.
7. in line 64, "to summaries" seems to be "to	Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

summarize”	
8. please add full term of abbreviations for the first usage in abstract and paper separately [for example ACR, ……]	The manuscript has been scanned for all abbreviations and when they first used. Please see highlighted wording throughout the paper.
9. what is the meaning of “stability” in line 76? Is it reliability?	Thank you for bringing this to our attention.
10. please change Sig. in table 1 to P-Value. In addition, all 0.000 should be <0.001.	They have been changed. Thank you.
11. Authors mentioned “A total of 100 surveys were collected.” It seems to be “A total of 100 radiographers participated in the survey.” Or something like this.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The wording has been changed. Please see abstract (line 13, page 1) and line 128 page 6.
12. this part seems wrong: “However, challenging cited by non-Saudi responded were similar to non-Saudi,” please evaluate and write it better.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This paragraph has been evaluated and written again. Please see lines 171-176, pages 9-10.
13. what is the meaning of Channing in table 5?	Sorry for this typo- it means “switching”.
14. what is the meaning of “proffered” in line 154?	It means “preferred”
15. Figure 2 has not been mentioned in text [result section] [it is mentioned in discussion after figure 3 that is wrong]. In addition, figure 2B is after figure 3 that is wrong	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The order of figures and tables have been checked throughout the manuscript.
16. figure 2 legend is similar to figure 3 legend that is wrong: “Figure 2.B. Preferred topics for education and training in mammography”	Thank you for bringing this inconsistency to our attention. All legends have been checked throughout the manuscript.
17. the authors mentioned: “Notably, our results showed acceptable levels of awareness among radiographers for the ACR tool (52%) but not for other evaluation methods (Figure 2).” Figure 2 is unrelated to this sentence. this scenario could be seen in line 194.	Thank you for pointing this out. In fact, this was related to figure 1. Please see line 240 page 13. However, for line 194, it related to figure 2 which was not uploaded. Please see line 196 page 12.
18. what is the meaning of “motion artifice” in line 202?	Thank you for pointing this out. It means “artefact”.
19. please follow journal format in references.	We have envaulted and modified the references based on journal format.
20. title of paper on PDF file is unclear.	We have copy and paste the title again.
21. it seems figure 2B is in fact Figure 3. B.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. All figure numbers and correct citation in the text have been checked throughout the manuscript.
22. please Upload each of the figures separately.	Will do so.

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 12 Jun 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 12 Jun 2022

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

5

Revision 4

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.

15-6-2022

Dear Editor in Chief,
Iranian Journal of Radiology

We are grateful to the editors and reviewers for their time and constructive comments on our manuscript. We have implemented their comments and suggestions and wish to submit a revised version of the manuscript for further consideration in the journal. Changes in the initial version of the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. Below, we also provide a point-by-point response explaining how we have addressed each of the editors or reviewers' comments. We look forward to the outcome of your assessment.

Yours sincerely,
On behalf of the co-authors
Dr. Salman Albeshan

Associate Editor Comments	
1. Please separate the objective part of paper according to guidelines.	Thank you for pointing this out. As requested, we have modified all headings according to the journal guidelines.
2. This sentence is unclear: "The other is regarding 4 the image quality evaluation systems (tools) that study sample are familiar with including PGMI ……" please clarify.	In this sentence, it means that section 2 of the survey has 2 main questions. The other means (question 2) is measuring the participants knowledge (how much they know- they are familiar) with image quality assessment tools. Please see below the modified sentence. The other question is about the familiarity of study sample about the image quality evaluation systems (tools) including PGMI (Perfect, Good, Moderate, Inadequate), EAR (Excellent, Acceptable, Repeat), EUROPEAN (European guidelines on quality criteria for diagnostic radiographic images) and ACR.
3. the authors wrote "Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha" it is better as "Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient"	Thanks. The phrase was modified.
4. In line 111, please correct: "at P value ≤ 0.05".	Thank you for bringing this to our attention.
5. please change "centre" in table 2 to "center"	Modified based on your comment.
6. it is better to introduce abbreviations in figure 1 [in legend in ()]	Modified based on your comment.
7. please locate PGMI, EAR, ACR and EUROPEAN in fig 1 at the middle location of related bars [they are located just below Saudi groups or bars].	Thanks. It is actually, in the middle location (please see screenshot). However, due to converting the word to pdf, the location could change.
8. please change P= 0.000 to P<0.001.	Modified based on your comment.
9. this sentence seems somehow unclear: "Our results	This sentence means that there was a positive significate

showed positive correlation between image evaluation tool scale with age group, experience in mammography and number of patients per week were noted (Table 3).” [were noted seems to be unnecessary]	correlation between the age group, experience in mammography and number of patients per week and the scale created based on image evaluation tool (EAR, PGMI, EUROPEAN and ACR). Please see modified sentence below. Our results showed positive correlation between image evaluation tools scale (EAR, PGMI, EUROPEAN and ACR) with age group, experience in mammography and number of patients per week.
10-line 224, this part seems to be wrong “our results indicated that showed that”	Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

5 Revision 4

1 comment · 19 Jun 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 19 Jun 2022

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