Iranian Journal of Radiology
Volume 20 · Issue 3 · e140628

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Factors Associated with the Citation Status of Papers Published in the Iranian Journal of Radiology (IJR) in the Past Five Years (2018 - 2022)

Hedayat Abbastabar, Madjid Shakiba, Mina Morsali

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
4 Sep 2023	31 Oct 2023	1 Nov 2023	10.5812/ijradiol-140628

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** Hooman Bakhshandeh, Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Referee 2, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 9
3 **Revision 2** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 10
Authors' reply to reviewers 11
Reviewer and editor comments 13
4 **Revision 3** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 14
Authors' reply to reviewers 15
Reviewer and editor comments 19
5 **Revision 4** Editor-in-Chief 20
Authors' reply to reviewers 21
Reviewer and editor comments 22

1 Original submission

4 comments · 10 Sep 2023 – 19 Sep 2023

Hooman Bakhshandeh Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 10 Sep 2023

- Data collection should be explained in detail. Were all the study variables available in the databases, or did the authors have to read the articles themselves? Who categorized the data? Who extracted the data, how many people were involved, and how was it done?
- All the variables and their subgroups should be defined in a table to ensure reliability and avoid misunderstanding. For example, what was the definition of "citation status"? Was it the number of citations for each article or at least one citation for an article? These types of questions can be asked about each of the variables.
- The categorization of data was really questionable. For example, regarding types of study design, why those 3 categories? Or for article type, where are the case reports? A review can also be a study type. Or for nationality: Iranian, Chinese, others? Why?
- All the numbers should be described as median (Q_1–Q_3).
- The reason behind the use of multiple logistic regression is not clear to me. What is the applicability of the results?
- Why did the authors categorize the scope as physics and non-physics?

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 19 Sep 2023

Dear Editor in Chief
The manuscript entitled "Factors associated with the citation status papers …" has focused on an interesting and important subject. However, the article has many critical defects as follows:
1- The authors' conclusion is as follows, and they repeated it a few times in their paper:
"The study found that factors like study design, title scope area, paper type, years of publication, number of first author papers in Scopus, and h-index of authors significantly influenced citation status. Multiple logistic regression identified years of publication, paper type, and title scope as the most significant predictors."
However, table three shows that after controlling for confounding variables, only the three parameters of years of publication, paper type, and title scope had meaningful associations. As a result, all of these statements should be edited accordingly.
2- The authors stated:
"The top three citing journals were the IJR itself, the Egyptian Journal of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, and Academic Radiology."
So, self-citation is an important factor, and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it into their model and analysis.
3- The authors wrote that the IJR publishes case reports, but they did not assess such reports in their research.
4- Most of the references are more than five years old. They have to be updated.
5- There are some unclear variables as follows:
a. H index of citing journal with a mean of 56.14
b. Number of sample size
c. Chinese as a kind of paper (in addition to research and review papers) in Table 2.
It is expected that the authors describe these points.
6- There are a couple of variables that are not readily understandable in English, and the authors should edit

them throughout the text accordingly:
a. Citation distribution of papers
b. Number of years of paper publication
c. Mon-Whitney U test, which should be replaced with Man-Whitney U test

Associate Editor MAJOR REVISION 19 Sep 2023

Dear EIC,
According to the reviewers, the article needs Major Revision.
Regards

Editor-in-Chief MAJOR REVISION 19 Sep 2023

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.

Response to the reviewer

Firstly, I want to express my sincere appreciation to the respected editor in chief for granting us the chance to revise the manuscript. Additionally, I would also like to extend my gratitude to the esteemed reviewers for their valuable time and insightful comments that have significantly improved and enriched the content. I would like to emphasize that in the response file to the reviewers, we have addressed each question using red font and highlighted the manuscript changes in green for reviewer 1 and blue for reviewer 2 comments. If there are any remaining uncertainties or if further revisions are required, I eagerly await your additional comments.

Best Regards

Reviewer 1: Thanks to the dear reviewer with insightful comments significantly improved and enriched the content.

1. Data collection should be explaining by details. The data collection section was expanded to provide more comprehensive details. Were all the study variables existed in the databases or the authors had to read the articles by themselves? A significant portion of the data was sourced from the IJR website, whereas the citation data was retrieved from Scopus databases. Who categorized the data? The variables were categorized by the researchers. Who / how many people did extract the data and how? Data extraction involved two researchers who gathered information by reviewing journal papers and conducting searches in Scopus databases for indexed data.
2. All the variables and their sub-groups should be defined in a table to keep the reliability and avoid misunderstanding. For example, what was the definition of “citation status”? was it the number of citations for each article or at least one citation for an article? These type of questions can be asked about each of the variables. The variables section was expanded to provide a more comprehensive description of stratification. Additionally, Table 1 presents the different strata for all variables. Furthermore, the citation status was defined as a binary variable indicating 'yes' or 'no' based on the number of citations for each paper.

3. The categorization of data was really questionable. For example, types of study design, why those 3 categories? The study design was classified into descriptive observational (case report, case series, ecological study, descriptive cross-sectional), analytical observational (analytical cross-sectional, case-control, cohort), and interventional (experimental and trials) categories, following guidelines from an epidemiology textbook. Or in article type, where are the case reports? Review can be a study type also. The article types were classified into research, which encompassed case reports and all original papers, and review, which included various types of review articles. Or Nationality: Iranian, Chinese, others? Why? This stratification was carried out based on the authors' nationality, focusing on the nationality with the highest number of publications in IJR. This approach was taken due to the relatively small percentage of publications from other nationalities.
4. All the numbers should be described as median (Q1 –Q3). It is worth mentioning that qualitative variables were presented using number (counts) and percentages, whereas quantitative variables were summarized using mean and standard deviation.
5. The reason behind the usage of multiple logistic regression is not clear to me. What is the applicability of the results? As mentioned in the last paragraph of the statistical analysis, a multiple binary logistic regression was conducted to determine the adjusted confounding factors that impact the citation status of the IJR. The dependent variable was the citation status (yes/no), and independent variables were chosen based on their significance (p-value < 0.1) in the univariate analysis.
6. Why the authors categorized the scope as physics and non-physics? As shown in Table 1, the variable 'Paper Title Scope Area' was categorized into vascular & intervention, chest, breast, neuroradiology, abdomen, musculoskeletal, physics, and other. As mentioned in results section, each year of publication increased the odds of citation by 0.54 times. Review papers had over 2.52 times higher odds of citation compared to research papers, and papers with a physics title had over 1.39 times higher odds of citation compared to papers on other topics. Therefore, it means that only these groups had a significant difference according to citation status.

Reviewer 2: Thanks to the dear reviewer with insightful comments significantly improved and enriched the content.

1. The authors conclusion is as follow and they repeated it a few times in their papers: ‘’The study found that factors like study design, title scope area, paper type, years of publication, number of first author papers in Scopus, and h-index of authors significantly influenced citation status. Multiple logistic regression identified years of publication, paper type, and title scope as the most significant predictors.’’ However, the table three shows that after controlling confounding variables, only three parameters of years of publication, paper type, and title scope had meaningful associations. As a result, all of these statements should be edited accordingly. The conclusion edited as “Our investigation examined the impact of multiple factors on citation status, including study design, title scope area, paper type, years of publication, number of first author papers in Scopus, and h-index of authors. However, after controlling for confounding variables, our analysis identified only three parameters—years of publication, paper type, and title scope—as meaningful predictors of citation status, as confirmed by multiple logistic regression analysis.”
2. The authors stated: ‘’The top three citing journals were the IJR itself, the Egyptian Journal of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, and Academic Radiology.’’ So, self-citation is an important factor and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it in their model and analysis. Self-citations accounted for less than 5% (precisely 4.36%) of the total. Therefore, upon removing self-citations, the results remained unchanged in terms of p-value.
3. The authors wrote that the IJR publishes case reports, but they did not assess such reports in their research. Case reports were classified within the descriptive study design category as well as the original research category.
4. Most of references are more than five years old. They have to be updated. The task has been completed.
5. There are some unclear variables as follows: It has done.

a. H index of citing journal with mean of 56.14. This means that the journals citing the IJR have an average h-index of 56.14.

b. Number of sample size. This refers to the number of sample size utilized in each published paper.

c. Chinese as a kind of paper (in addition to research and review papers) in Table 2. In Table 2, the paper type was categorized as research and review, while Chinese nationality was considered for author classification.

6. There are a couple of variables which are not well understandable in English and the authors should edit them in the entire text, accordingly:

a. Citation distribution of papers. Categories of citation number

b. Number of years of paper publication: Duration of Paper Publication

c. Mon-Whitney U test, which should be replaced as Man-Whitney U test. Mann–Whitney U test was replaced.

2 Revision 1

4 comments · 2 Oct 2023 – 9 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 2 Oct 2023

Dear Associate Editor
I reviewed the authors' answers. However, there are still some challenges.
1- I had asked the researchers: "self-citation is an important factor and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it in their model and analysis."
However, they did not provide this model and its analysis in any table.
2- The researchers classified the articles into two different groups, research and review articles, and included case reports among the research articles, but I highly recommend that they categorize all the papers into three groups: research articles, review articles, and case reports, and then re-analyze the data.
Including case reports among research articles is wrong. They should consider case reports as a separate category and re-analyze the data again.
3- Although the researchers changed the conclusion of the discussion correctly, the beginning of the discussion remained unchanged.
Regards

Referee 2 Reviewer

ACCEPT 9 Oct 2023

Dear AE,
Accept

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 9 Oct 2023

Dear EIC,
The article needs Major Revision.
Best Regards

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 9 Oct 2023

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.

Response to the reviewer

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the editor in chief for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript. I appreciate the time and insightful comments provided by the reviewer, which have greatly improved the quality and depth of the content. We have diligently addressed each question raised by the reviewer and have clearly indicated our responses using red font. Additionally, we have highlighted the specific changes made to the manuscript in red, specifically in response to reviewer 2's comments. We remain open to further feedback or suggestions. If there are any remaining uncertainties or if additional revisions are necessary, we eagerly await any further comments or guidance that you may provide. Your input is invaluable in refining the manuscript and ensuring its overall quality.

Best Regards

Reviewer 2 comments:

1- I had asked the researchers: ‘’self-citation is an important factor and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it in their model and analysis.’’ However, they did not provide this model and its analysis in any Table.

Regarding self-citation, it should be mentioned that the aim of the study was to assess factors related to total citation, and self-citation is considered as part of the dependent variable, not an independent variable, and it exists in the model. Additionally, only 14 out of a total of 321 citations (i.e., 4.36%) were self-citations, and statistically excluding this number does not result in any significant changes in the findings or the level of significance of the relationships between variables. Therefore, there is no need to present the same findings again.

The researchers classified the articles into two different groups of research and review articles -2 and considered case reports within the research articles, but I highly recommend them to categorize .all the papers into three groups of research, review, and case reports and then re-analyze the data .which is wrong. They should consider them as a separate category and re-analyze the data again

Regarding this comment, it should be noted that the case report falls under the category of descriptive studies from a methodological perspective. Therefore, in this study, we classified different types of studies under the variable of study design, and we placed the case report in the category of observational descriptive studies alongside case series and descriptive cross-sectional studies, according to epidemiology reference books. Additionally, the results of univariate analyses also indicated that the percentage of citation for observational descriptive studies is significantly lower compared to analytical observational studies (case-control and cohort) and intervention studies (the results are observable in Table 2, row 1).

3- Although the researchers changed the conclusion of the discussion correctly, the beginning of the discussion remained unchanged. These changes have been made. "The analysis focused on papers published in the IJR from 2018 to 2022. Univariate analysis revealed that study design, paper title scope area, paper type, duration of paper publication, number of first author papers in Scopus, and h-index of first and corresponding authors in Scopus were statistically associated with citation. However, after adjusting for confounding variables in multiple logistic regression, the duration of paper publication emerged as the most influential predictor of citation, followed by the paper's title topic area and type."

3 Revision 2

3 comments · 24 Oct 2023 – 24 Oct 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 24 Oct 2023

Dear Associate Editor
I reviewed the authors' answers. However, there are still some challenges.
1- I had asked the researchers: "self-citation is an important factor and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it in their model and analysis."
However, they did not provide this model and its analysis in any table.
2- The researchers classified the articles into two different groups of research and review articles and considered case reports within the research articles, but I highly recommend that they categorize all the papers into three groups—research articles, review articles, and case reports—and then reanalyze the data. This is wrong. They should consider case reports as a separate category and reanalyze the data again.
3- Although the researchers changed the conclusion of the discussion correctly, the beginning of the discussion remained unchanged.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 24 Oct 2023

Dear EIC,
The article needs Major Revision.
Regards

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 24 Oct 2023

Dear authors,
Your article needs major 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.

Response to the reviewer

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the editor in chief for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript. I appreciate the time and insightful comments provided by the reviewer, which have greatly improved the quality and depth of the content. We have diligently addressed each question raised by the reviewer and have clearly indicated our responses using red font. Additionally, we have highlighted the specific changes made to the manuscript in red, specifically in response to reviewer 2's comments. We remain open to further feedback or suggestions. If there are any remaining uncertainties or if additional revisions are necessary, we eagerly await any further comments or guidance that you may provide. Your input is invaluable in refining the manuscript and ensuring its overall quality.

Best Regards

Reviewer 2 comments:

1- I had asked the researchers: ‘’self-citation is an important factor and it is expected that the researchers evaluate the self-citation variable and enter it in their model and analysis.’’ However, they did not provide this model and its analysis in any Table.

Following the feedback of the esteemed referee, 14 time self-citations were examined and it was determined that they are related to 13 articles. Among them, only 5 articles had been cited once, which were transferred to the group of uncited articles in the reanalysis, taking into account self-citations. The results were checked, and according to expectations and statistical reasoning, no significant changes were observed in the variables related to citability. Only very insignificant changes in the level of significance, as well as the number and percentage of the two groups, were noted. The results of these analyses can be viewed in the following.

Results of Chi-square & independent T-test after removing 14 times self-citation from analysis

			Binary without self-citation status			P-value
			no	yes	Total	
Type of study design	Descriptive	Count	108	36	144	0.041
		% within Type of study design	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%	
	Observational analytical	Count	117	66	183	
		% within Type of study design	63.9%	36.1%	100.0%	
	Interventional	Count	17	13	30	
		% within Type of study design	56.7%	43.3%	100.0%	

			Binary without self-citation status			P-value
			no	yes	Total	
Title scope	Neuro	Count	17	15	32	< 0.001
		% within Title scope	53.1%	46.9%	100.0%	
	MSK	Count	10	19	29	
		% within Title scope	34.5%	65.5%	100.0%	
	Vascular and Intervention	Count	33	24	57	
		% within Title scope	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%	
	Breast	Count	22	16	38	
		% within Title scope	57.9%	42.1%	100.0%	
	Chest	Count	29	14	43	
		% within Title scope	67.4%	32.6%	100.0%	
	Abdomen	Count	20	10	30	
		% within Title scope	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%	
	Physics	Count	14	6	20	
		% within Title scope	70.0%	30.0%	100.0%	
	Other	Count	97	11	108	
		% within Title scope	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%	

			Binary without self-citation status			P-value
			no	yes	Total	
Type of paper	Original	Count	183	92	275	0.024
		% within Type of paper	66.5%	33.5%	100.0%	
	Review	Count	1	4	5	
		% within Type of paper	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	
	Case report	Count	58	19	77	
		% within Type of paper	75.3%	24.7%	100.0%	

	Binary without self-citation status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	P-value
Number of years that article was published	no	242	2.86	1.426	0.000
	yes	115	3.88	1.148	
Number of first author papers in the year of paper publication in Scopus	no	242	38.07	58.641	0.039
	yes	115	53.18	75.465	
H-index of first author papers in the year of paper publication in Scopus	no	242	7.88	8.714	0.010
	yes	115	10.58	10.064	
H-index of corresponding author papers in the year of paper publication in Scopus	no	242	8.77	9.427	0.032
	yes	115	11.03	8.945	

The researchers classified the articles into two different groups of research and review articles -2 and considered case reports within the research articles, but I highly recommend them to categorize .all the papers into three groups of research, review, and case reports and then re-analyze the data .which is wrong. They should consider them as a separate category and re-analyze the data again

It was done.

3- Although the researchers changed the conclusion of the discussion correctly, the beginning of the discussion remained unchanged. These changes have been made. "The analysis focused on

papers published in the IJR from 2018 to 2022. Univariate analysis revealed that study design, paper title scope area, paper type, duration of paper publication, number of first author papers in Scopus, and h-index of first and corresponding authors in Scopus were statistically associated with citation. However, after adjusting for confounding variables in multiple logistic regression, the duration of paper publication emerged as the most influential predictor of citation, followed by the paper's title topic area and type."

4 Revision 3

2 comments · 25 Oct 2023 – 30 Oct 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 25 Oct 2023

Dear EIC,
The article is acceptable for publication in IJR.
Regards

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 30 Oct 2023

1- Please add sequential numbers to titles and subtitles.

2- Please change “number of sample size” to “sample size”.

3- Please abbreviate journal names in the references.

4- Please change vascular &intervention in the table to vascular &interventional.

5- Please change the P-value of 0.00 in tables 2 and 3 to <0.001.

6- Please change pf in table 3 to of.
7- Please insert an objective section in the main text and abstract. (Write separately.)

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.

Response to the EIC

I am extremely grateful to the editor in chief for providing us with the opportunity to revise the manuscript. We have highlighted the specific changes made to the manuscript. We are open to any further feedback or suggestions. If there are any remaining uncertainties or if additional revisions are required, we eagerly anticipate any further comments or guidance that you may offer. Your input is essential in refining the manuscript and ensuring its overall excellence.

Best Regards

EIC comments:

1-please add sequential numbers to titles and sub-titles: It was done.

2-please change “number of sample size” to “sample size”: It was done.

3-please abbreviate journal names in references: It was done.

4-please change vascular &intervention in table to vascular &interventional: It was done.

5-please change P-Value of 0.00 in t able 2 and 3 to <0.001: It was done.

6-please change pf in table 3 to of: It was done.

7-Please insert an objective section in the main text and abstract. (write separately): It was written previously.

5 Revision 4

1 comment · 1 Nov 2023

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 1 Nov 2023

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