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.92005
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(1); e92005

Peer Review Report for "Post-Molar Stage I Low-Risk Gestational Trophoblastic Neoplasia: Transvaginal Ultrasound Findings and Their Correlation with Chemotherapy Response"

Author(s): Behnaz Moradi, Ali Borhani, Fariba Yarandi, Maryam Rahmani, Elham Shirali, Mahrooz Malek, Nasim Batavani, Mohammad Ali Kazemi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Apr 2019
Revised Date: 26 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 30 Nov 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0)

22 Apr 2019

Dear AE,

1. The type of study is cross-sectional and should be modified throughout the text.

2. In the statistical analysis section, it should be clearly explained which indicators and tests for what variables and purposes were used.

3. The way to present results in tables is very difficult:

3.1. The table should be self-explanatory, that is understandable without reference to the text.

3.2. In the table, variables, and results should be presented as described in the text; instead of the variable group code, the state name (class) should be written.

4. The important thing is the small number of samples; therefore, a power test is required to determine the adequacy of the sample size.

5. In terms of writing, each word must first be written in full format, with the abbreviation once in the text, and then abbreviated.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 1 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Method:
1. Please mention the date during which the study was performed.
2. In 2nd paragraph, "endocavitary prob" should be "endovaginal prob".
3. Please mention how many patients met the inclusion criteria at first and how many were excluded according to Figo score of more than 7?
4. Considering that the study was performed retrospectively, were all the precise information such as RI and PI presented in all patients' history documents?
Results:
1. Some sentences are the same as the method. Please omit the repeated parts.
Conclusion:
1. According to non-significant differences, you can't judge the role of ultrasound in treatment choices.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 19 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
The Article is original and relevant.
The method, result, and discussion are acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 2 Jul 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 2 Jul 2019

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

We would like to thank the reviewers for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows:

Reviewer 1:

1. **The type of study is cross-sectional and should be modified throughout the text.**
   The type of study was changed to cross-sectional in the materials and methods section.

2. **In the statistical analysis section, it should be clearly explained which indicators and tests for what variables and purposes were used.**
   Statiscal analysis section were updated and required data were added.

3. ***The way to present results in tables is very difficult: The table should be self-explanatory, that is understandable without reference to the text.***
   In the table, variables and results should be presented as described in the text; instead of the variable group code, the state name (class) should be written.
   Tables were edited to be self-explanatory.

4. ***The important thing is the small number of samples; therefore, a power test is required to determine the adequacy of the sample size.***
   A 80% power test for sample size was added to the text in materials and methods section.

5. ***In terms of writing, each word must first be written in full format, with the abbreviation once in the text, and then abbreviated.***
   The first use of each abbreviation was spelled out in the whole text.

Reviewer 3:

1. **Please mention the date during which the study was performed.**
   Timeframe of the study was added to the test.

2 ***In 2nd paragraph, "endocavitary probe" should be "endovaginal probe".***
   endocavitary probe was replaced with "endovaginal probe

3 ***The important thing is the small number of samples; therefore, a power test is required to determine the adequacy of the sample size.***
   An 80% power test for sample size was added to the text in materials and methods section.

4 ***Please mention how many patients met the inclusion criteria at first and how many were exluded according to Figo score of more than 7?***

This was added to the text in the edited version.

5 ***Considering that the study was performed retrospectively, were all the precise information such as RI and PI presented in all patients history documents?***
We have archived each GTN patient's Doppler indices and ultrasound findings in our institute and this study's data were derived from our archive.

6 ***Some sentences are same as method. Please omit the repeated parts***.
Repeated sentences were omitted from the Results section.

7 ***According to non-significant differences, you can't judge about the role of ultrasound in treatment choices.***
There are multiple other studies that suggest ultrasound findings could help patient management regarding the selection of treatment plan, however our findings were not significant in this regard. Conclusion was edited to be more justified.

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) — 7 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the respected authors for making the corrections, it should be said that the manuscript is methodologically approved.
Thanks.

firoozeh ahmadi: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 1 Oct 2019

Dear AE,
All parts of this article (introduction, materials and methods, discussion, results) have been written too long. This article deserves to publish after being summarized.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Best.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 24 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The author may respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes to make in the manuscript.
1- Please add Background to the abstract.
2- The tables have not been mentioned in the manuscript in order. You mentioned table 3 and then (1-4). Please mention tables incorrect order in the manuscript.
Thank you.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 25 Nov 2019

Dear Authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

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 Dr. Firouznia,

We would like to thank the reviewers for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows:

Associate Editor:

1- *Please add Background to the abstract.*
Background added to the abstract during submission of revision.
2- *The tables have not been mentioned in the manuscript in order. You mentioned table 3 and then (1-4). Please mention tables in correct order in the manuscript.*
The order of tables were corrected in the revised version

With Best Regards,

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.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) 30 Nov 2019

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards,
Associate Editor

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (2) 30 Nov 2019

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