Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 19 · Issue 1 · e122440

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Evaluation of the Relationship Between Prostate-Specific Antigen Levels, Gleason Scores, and ^{68}Ga-PSMA PET/CT Scan Findings in Prostate Cancer Patients

Abtin Doroudinia, Najmeh Darvishian, Mehrdad Bakhshayesh Karam, Habib Emami

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
8 Jan 2022	18 Apr 2022	24 Apr 2022	10.5812/iranjradiol-122440

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** Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 12
4 **Revision 3** Editor-in-Chief 13
Authors' reply to reviewers 14
Reviewer and editor comments 16

1 Original submission

1 comment · 9 Mar 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Mar 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.

Point by point answer to the Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Good subject with up to date needs in radiology. Methodology is fine.

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Reviewer 2:

Dear associate editor,

The article could be acceptable for the publication.

Best Regards

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Reviewer 3:

Thanks, from authors for their submission to the IJR.

Regarding this manuscript, it can be said that the title of the study is not in line with the presented results. If the purpose is to measure diagnostic value, sensitivity and specificity indices should be calculated using by gold standard method (second pathology). If the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship among PSA levels, Gleason scores and results of 68Ga-PSMAPET/CT, the title and objectives should be revised. Also, the conclusion should be in accordance with the title and purpose of the study.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The title is revised to better get in line with the presented results.

In addition, the following points should be fundamentally amended:

1. In terms of the structure of scientific writing, the manuscript needs to be corrected.
   Answer: The manuscript has been revised in terms of the structure of scientific writing.
2. It also needs to be edited according to English editing.
   Answer: The manuscript is English language edited per your demand.

3. The method section was written very incompletely and should be subtitled such as patients (sampling method and statistical population, inclusion and exclusion criteria), variables (measurement method, classification), imaging protocol, image analysis, pathology, ethical considerations (informed consent and ethic code), statistical analysis (add a significant level).
   Answer: The “Method” section is revised per your request.
4. All acronym words firstly should be written in full form. Do not use abbreviations in the title as much as possible.
   Answer: We accommodated this very true comment.
5. This is a cross-sectional study that should be written in the abstract and full text method.
   Answer: We mentioned that this is a cross sectional study in the abstract and full text method per your request.
6. In the first section abstract and full text results, the demographic and clinical characteristics of patients should be presented in the text and table.
   Answer: We accommodated this very true comment.
7. In Tables 1 and 2, add a column for the number. Mention the summary words below the table. An asterisk should be placed on the significant level and the name of the statistical test should be written below the table. Correlation in the title replace by relationship. Table titles should be complete and self-explanatory. Move table 5 to after of 2.
   Answer: We accommodated the requested revisions in the tables.

Reviewer 4:

Please mention ethical code with the link address.

Answer: IR.SBMU.MSP.REC.1398.196

Please clarify the financial resource and mention the number grant.

Answer: In the uploaded “COI” form, we clearly stated that there was no financial resource for our work. There was no conflict of interest and we have nothing to disclose.

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 site:
https://brief.land/iranjradiol/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#conflicts_of_interest.html

Answer: The completed “COI” form is uploaded per your request.

Reviewer 5:

Accept

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Yours sincerely

Corresponding author

2 Revision 1

1 comment · 3 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 3 Apr 2022

Dear authors,
Your article needs Major 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.

Point by point answer to the Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Good subject with up to date needs in radiology. Methodology is fine.

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Reviewer 2:

Dear associate editor,

The article could be acceptable for the publication.

Best Regards

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Reviewer 3:

Thanks, from authors for their submission to the IJR.

Regarding this manuscript, it can be said that the title of the study is not in line with the presented results. If the purpose is to measure diagnostic value, sensitivity and specificity indices should be calculated using by gold standard method (second pathology). If the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship among PSA levels, Gleason scores and results of 68Ga-PSMAPET/CT, the title and objectives should be revised. Also, the conclusion should be in accordance with the title and purpose of the study.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The title is revised to better get in line with the presented results.

In addition, the following points should be fundamentally amended:

1. In terms of the structure of scientific writing, the manuscript needs to be corrected.
   Answer: The manuscript has been revised in terms of the structure of scientific writing.
2. It also needs to be edited according to English editing.
   Answer: The manuscript is English language edited per your demand.

3. The method section was written very incompletely and should be subtitled such as patients (sampling method and statistical population, inclusion and exclusion criteria), variables (measurement method, classification), imaging protocol, image analysis, pathology, ethical considerations (informed consent and ethic code), statistical analysis (add a significant level).
   Answer: The “Method” section is revised per your request.
4. All acronym words firstly should be written in full form. Do not use abbreviations in the title as much as possible.
   Answer: We accommodated this very true comment.
5. This is a cross-sectional study that should be written in the abstract and full text method.
   Answer: We mentioned that this is a cross sectional study in the abstract and full text method per your request.
6. In the first section abstract and full text results, the demographic and clinical characteristics of patients should be presented in the text and table.
   Answer: We accommodated this very true comment.
7. In Tables 1 and 2, add a column for the number. Mention the summary words below the table. An asterisk should be placed on the significant level and the name of the statistical test should be written below the table. Correlation in the title replace by relationship. Table titles should be complete and self-explanatory. Move table 5 to after of 2.
   Answer: We accommodated the requested revisions in the tables.

Reviewer 4:

Please mention ethical code with the link address.

Answer: https://IR.SBMU.MSP.REC.1398.196

Please clarify the financial resource and mention the number grant.

Answer: In the uploaded “COI” form, we clearly stated that there was no financial resource for our work. There was no conflict of interest and we have nothing to disclose.

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 site:
https://brief.land/iranjradiol/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#conflicts_of_interest.html

Answer: The completed “COI” form is uploaded per your request.

Reviewer 5:

Accept

Answer: Thank you a lot. We greatly appreciate it.

Yours sincerely

A.D.

Corresponding author

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 18 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 18 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.

Point by point answer to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks from authors for appropriate editing the manuscript.
Currently, it is ready for publication in IJR in terms of methodology view.

***Answer**: Thank you a lot for your comment to accept our manuscript.*

Reviewer 2:
This paper is suitable for publication in IJR.

***Answer**: Thank you a lot for your comment to accept our manuscript.*

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Accept

Answer: Thank you a lot for your comment to accept our manuscript.

Associate Editor 2:
1-it seems the term 68Ga-PSMAPET/CT needs a space between 68Ga-PSMA and PET/CT [68Ga-PSMA PET/CT]. Somewhere the space has been deleted [for example in title]. Please unify this term in all paper. ***Answer**: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

2-please add full term of abbreviations in the abstract and paper separately [for example, PSMAPET/CT, PSA, ……..]. Please add full term of PSA in title. ***Answer**: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

3-please add objective part to abstract and paper based on instructions of journal.
***Answer**: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

4-this part is incomplete: In this a cross-sectional study. ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

5-please write this part with complete sentences: Variables: PSA level (laboratory results), Gleason score (Pathology report), maximum of standard uptake value (SUVmax) (amount of radiotracer uptake in the tumoral lesion). ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

6-please add numbers to titles and sub-titles. ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

7-in line 73, the part "were recorded" could be deleted. Similar point for were reported in line 80 could be mentioned. ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

8-the authors mentioned: "In this study, no significant correlation was observed between Gleason score and total PSA value (correlation coefficient equal to 0.228, PSA value equal to 0.114)." this sentence seems unclear; for each pair variables, we have only one coefficient. What is the meaning of, PSA value equal to 0.114? ***Answer****: We agree with you and seem this was a typo. We corrected.*

9-please add full term of abbreviations in each table as footnote. ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

10-what is the meaning of extent of conflict in table 3? ***Answer****: Thank you for your comment. We did the correction in the text.*

Yours sincerely

A.D.

Corresponding author

4 Revision 3

1 comment · 24 Apr 2022

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 24 Apr 2022

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