OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Radiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/iranjradiol.86497
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 16(4); e86497

Peer Review Report for "Apparent Diffusion Coefficient Value Changes of Normal Uterine Cervix with Aging"

Author(s): Funda Dinç Elibol, Sezen Bozkurt Köseoğlu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Nov 2018
Revised Date: 21 Aug 2019
Accepted Date: 25 Aug 2019

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 27 Nov 2018

Dear EIC,
This manuscript compared “Apparent Diffusion Coefficient Value Changes of Normal Uterine Cervix with Aging”. This content review focuses on suggestions I believe the authors may want to address prior to journal submission.
• The introduction is too superficial and does not refer to the vast number of major studies on the topic.
• IJR Authors guideline should be checked carefully with especial focus on abstract, and also grammatical revision is needed.
• Statistical analysis and method parts should be completed with more details.
• Quality of clinical images is too low and should be changed to high-quality ones with more details.
In Fact, the paper needs major revision to considering for publication in IJR.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 28 Dec 2018

Dear AE,
The article has no considerable statistical/ methodological problem and can be accepted.

However, there are some minor problems as follows:

- "p = 0.000" should be corrected as " p < 0.001".
- Tables can be removed and the relevant results expressed in the text.

Best Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)**

5 Feb 2019

Dear EIC,

The article needs major revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)**

5 Feb 2019

Dear Author,

The reviewers' comments are mentioned. Please correct the details as mentioned above carefully according to reviewers' request.

Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor and reviewers,

First of all, thank you for your precious comments and recomendations.

The corrections are done due to your suggestions.

Suggestions of Reviewer 1:

Suggestion 1: "p = 0.000" should be corrected as " p < 0.001".

Correction: The age and cervix ADC value-were inversely correlated (r=-0.382, **p<0.001**; Figure 2).

Suggestion 2: Tables can be removed and the relevant results expressed in the text.

Correction: Table I and III were deleted, their results expressed in the text. Table II was not deleted, the values that expressed in the table were excluded from the main text.

Associate Editor 1:

Suggestion 1: The introduction is too superficial and does not refer to the vast number of major studies on the topic.

Correction: Introduction is expanded with new references.

Suggestion 2: IJR Authors guideline should be checked carefully with especial focus on abstract, and also grammatical revision is needed.

Correction: Abstract and texted are revised due to IJR guidelines. Grammatical revision is done by a native speaker.

Suggestion 3: Statistical analysis and method parts should be completed with more details.

Correction: Statistical analysis and method parts are expanded with more details.Statistical analysis was corrected with author in Statistic deparment of our university.

Suggestion 4: Quality of clinical images is too low and should be changed with high-quality one with more details.

Correction: Images are changes with higher-quality imges.

A revision trackedversion and a clean copy are being prepared with both suggested changes and English editing.

If you have any further suggestions to improve the value of this paper, we are willing to consider them.

With best regards,
the Authors

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 5 May 2019

Dear AE,
The manuscript is acceptable in its current revision.
Best Regards

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 8 May 2019

Dear AE,
The revisions were made.
No more comment or revision is suggested.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 12 May 2019

Dear AE,
The subject is interesting and the article is well written.
In the method part, in radiologic evaluation, the description should be precise and a better explanation for ROI selection could be done.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 19 May 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript could be accepted after minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 19 May 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor and reviewers,

Thank you very much for your interest and time spent in evaluating this paper.

The corrections are done due to your suggestions and highlighted in the text.

If you have any further suggestions to improve the value of this paper, we are willing to consider them.

With best regards,
the Authors

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (2)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) 19 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
This article is appropriate to publish in IJR.
Regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 20 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should respond to all comments one by one.
1- Please add objectives to the manuscript.
2- The quality of the images is low. Please add better quality images.
3- Please add manufacturer characteristics for SPSS software.
Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) 21 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Dear editor and reviewers,

First of all, thank you for your precious comments and recommendations.

The corrections are done due to your suggestions.

1-Please add objectives to the manuscript.

Objectives is added to the text.

2-The quality of the images is low. Please add better quality images.

The quality of the images are improved.

3-Please add manufacturer characteristics for SPSS software.

Manufacturer characteristics for SPSS software is added to the text.

With best regards,
the Authors

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (3)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 25 Aug 2019

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 25 Aug 2019

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.