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.92990
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(3); e92990

Peer Review Report for "Dual Energy CT Evaluation of the Severity of Pulmonary Thromboembolism: Correlation of Pulmonary Perfusion Score with CT"

Author(s): Selen Bayraktaroglu, Akın Cinkooglu, Recep Savas, Naim Ceylan, Mustafa Bozdağ, Haydar Soydaner Karakuş, Gursel Cok

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 19 May 2019
Revised Date: 17 May 2020
Accepted Date: 26 May 2020

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) — 29 May 2019

Dear AE,
In terms of methodology, the study was designed and analyzed correctly, and there were only a few small points which were commented in the text of the manuscript.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 17 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks for submitting the research at IJR.I have some questions and comments for the authors:
1- please organize abstract in 5 section; 1-background2-objectives3-material and methods4-results5-conclusions
2- the sample size is low, why do not you collect data from a larger population? your research is retrograde and it is possible to extend your sample size
3- please mention the city and country of study in the method section
4- How many observers did you have? Is your study blind?
5- all references are articles that are published before 2012, why did not you use new

references in your article especially in the discussion?
6- please explain your protocol of ct angiography completely, what are your references for protocol design?is 60 ml contrast enough for doing pulmonary CT angiography? which contrast concentration did you use?
7- CHF is a confounding factor in the evaluation of the relationship between p score and echocardiography and it must be excluded
With best regards

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

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is studied, and there are some comments which should be addressed by the author. According to the comments, the document needs major revision.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 3 Aug 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,

I am grateful to you and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions provided.

According to the reviewers comments, the revision was performed on the manuscript.

Our reply to questions of our reviewers is as follows;

Reviewer 1:

Hi Dear Authors
In terms of methodology, the study was designed and analyzed correctly, and there were only a few small points which were commented in the text of the manuscript.

No revision was suggested by this reviewer.

Reviewer 2:

-please organize abstract in 5 section; 1-background2-objectives3-material and methods4-results5-conclusions

Abstract was organised as mentioned.

-sample size is low ,why do not you collect data from larger population?your research is retrograde and it is possible to extend your sample size

The sample size is increased to 55 patients.So due to this change the statistical analysis was performed with the new data. The new findings were similar with the previous findings. According to the new findings the manuscript was rewritten.(The figures and tables were changed accordingly.). The changes are highlighted in the text.

-how many observers did you have?Is your study blind?

Two observers reviwed the CT images. Radiologists were blinded to the clinical data.

To explain this better , the following sentence was added in the DECT data analysis part:

‘’Two radiologists with over 5 and 11 years of experience in chest CT reading reviewed the CT images. They were blinded to clinical data of patients. CT images were analyzed simultaneously and by consensus between two radiologists.’’

-all references are articles that are published before 2012, why did not you use from new references in your article specially in discussion?

Some recent studies are added in the discusion and references. The number of the references are revised in the manuscript accordingly. The mentioned articles are as follows.

‘’ Kong WF, Wang YT, Yin LL, Ou H, Tao KY et al. Clinical risk stratification of acute pulmonary embolism: comparing the usefulness of CTA obstruction score and

pulmonary perfusion defect score with dual-energy CT. Int J Cardiovasc Imaging 2017; 33:2039-2047."

''Meinel FG, Nance JW, Schoepf J et al. Predictive Value of Computed Tomography in Acute Pulmonary Embolism: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Am J Med 2015;128: 747-59.e2. ''

-please explain your protocol of ct angiography completely, what is your references for protocol design?is 60 ml contrast enough for doing pulmonary CT angiography?which contrast concentration did you use?,

The CT angiography protocole is revised and rewritten as follows.

A bolus of 1ml/kg body weight of nonionic contrast material (Iopromide, Ultravist 370, Bayer Schering Pharma, Berlin, Germany) was injected through a catheter in the antecubital vein at a rate of 4 mL/s using an automatic injector

-CHF is confounding factor in evaluation of relationship between p score and echocardiography and it must be excluded

Congestive heart failure was present in 5 of the patients as mentioned in the table 2.

As a drawback it was mentioned in limitations section as follows;

Congestive heart failure might be a confounding factor in evaluation of p score and echocardiography *and was present in 5 of our patients.*

Regards,

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) 12 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
About this manuscript must be said that it is relatively suitable for final acceptance, but needs some partial statistical results presentation styles as follows:
1. It is better exact p-value to be reported
2. When exact p-value reported ii should not be reported <0.05.
3. The critical value of statistical tests should not be reported e.g. U test.
Thanks.

fahimeh zeinalkhani: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 29 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
• new revision is good and the authors answered my questions well.
With best regards

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Feb 2020

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

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Feb 2020

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 Editor,

I am grateful to you and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions provided.

According to the reviewers comments, the revision was performed on the manuscript.

Our reply to questions of our reviewers is as follows;

Reviewer 1:
• new revision is good and you answer to my questions well

No revision was suggested by this reviewer.

Reviewer 2:
About this manuscript must be said that it is relatively suitable for final acceptance, but needs some partial statistical results presentation styles as follows:
1. It is better exact p-value to be reported/ When exact p-value reported ii should not be reported <0.05.

Exact p value is reported in the manuscript.

3. The critical value of statistical tests should not be reported e.g. U test.

Manuscript and abstract is revised according to reviewer's comment.

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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (2) — 23 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
At present, this manuscript is acceptable methodologically.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 29 Mar 2020

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

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 26 Apr 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 27 Apr 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

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.

Reply to reviewers:

I am grateful to you and the reviewers for their valuable suggestions provided.

According to the reviewers comments, the revision was performed on the manuscript.

Our reply to questions of our reviewers is as follows;

Reviewer 1:

At present, this manuscript is acceptable according to methodologically.

No revision was suggested by this reviewer.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1: (-)

No revision was suggested by this editor.

Associate Editor 2:

1-In the Statistical Analysis, please add the characteristics of the software.

The characteristics of statistical analysis software is added to manuscript as follows;

‘’The statistical assessment was performed using statistical software IBM Corp. Released 2017 SPSS Statistics for Windows, version 25.0 (IBM Corp. Armonk, N.Y.USA).”

2-In the CTA imaging protocol, please add explanation about DE technique.

The details of Dual energy technique is added.

‘’All studies were conducted on a single tube DECT scanner with rapid kvp switching (Discovery 750 HD, GE Healthcare; Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA). The DE images were acquired using the spectral imaging mode with rapid kV switch from 140 kVp to 80 kVp during a CT gantry rotation. The examinations were performed with Dual Energy CTA technique”

3-You have mentioned reference 14 before reference 13. Please make sure all references sure in correct order.

The order is changed in manuscript and references. Changes are highlighted.

4- In the CT Obstruction and Perfusion Scores, you have mentioned r=0.748. Is this number correct? There is r2=0.568 in figure 3. Please clarify.
5- In Relationship between ventricular ratio and CT obstruction and perfusion score, you have mentioned r=0.432 and r=0.424. In figure 4, r2=0.215 and r2=0.189. Please clarify and make sure you change the necessary parts related to these figures.

Reply to question number 4 and 5;

The ‘’r’’ values mentioned in the manuscript (r:0.568,r: 0.432, r:0.424) are correct.

The R2 numbers seen on figures are not the r numbers. Statistically there is no mistake. So to clarify this confusion we deleted those numbers seen on figures.

6-In figures 1 and 2, please add patients’ characteristics (age, gender, and signs and symptoms) if applicable.

The patient characteritics are added to figure legends for Figure 1 and 2 according to your suggestions.

Thank you.

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) 13 May 2020

Dear EIC,
Please the authors respond to the following comment. Then, highlight any changes they make in the manuscript.
They have changed reference 14 to 13. Then reference 15 has been mentioned before reference 14. The references should be listed in order. Change the list of references accordingly.
Thank you.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (3) 13 May 2020

Dear authors,
Your article needs Minor Revision.
Regards

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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.

Reply to Associate Editor:

The revision was performed on the manuscript acording to your suggestions.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:

You have changed reference 14 to 13. Then reference 15 has been mentioned before reference 14. The references should be listed in order. Please revise the manuscript and make sure the references are listed in correct order. Change the list of references accordingly.

Reply,

We revised the manuscript and the references according to your suggestions, References are mentioned in the manuscript in the correct order.

Thank you,

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (4)

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** (4) 24 May 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (4) 26 May 2020

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