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.93054
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(2); e93054

Peer Review Report for "Eccrine Hidradenoma Mimicking Primary Breast Cancer on Mammography and Ultrasonography"

Author(s): Min Jung Ryu, Youngseon Kim, Seungeun Lee, Joon Hyuk Choi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 May 2019
Revised Date: 1 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 29 Feb 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) 13 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
- It is a rare case of skin lesion, mimicking breast cancer.
- Images are not available now.
- If Quality of images be accepted, after minor revision it is acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 24 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- How many similar cases have been reported in literature? Please add in the introduction or discussion.
2- Did the authors request MRI for patient? If yes, please add the findings and images to the paper.
3- What was the sono-BIRADS score of the patient?
4- What was the surgical method? Complete excision of mass? Please clarify in the paper?
5- Why the authors ascribed BIRADS 5 to lesion? [as the mass was the oval shape and circumscribed margin].

Thanks.

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

10 Jul 2019

Dear AE
Thanks for inviting me to review the case report.
As you know, Eccrine hidradenoma is a rare and interesting case, especially in breast skin, from a pathological point of view. However, it is obvious from the clinical and imaging findings that the patient's mass is a dermal lesion that cannot be named as a highly suggestive malignant breast lesion (BIRADS category:5). The mass is superficial, has an air-tissue interface, and shows being type calcifications. I reviewed the literature and found out that the clinical presentation is usually suggestive of a benign lesion. Anyway gathering the imaging findings of an Eccrine hidradenoma is interesting enough to report it after changing the topic to"imaging findings of an Eccrine hidradenoma on breast skin and revising the reports of the images.
Thanks.

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

23 Jul 2019

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs major revision.
Thanks.

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

24 Jul 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.

Answers to Reviewer's comments

Reviewer 1:

1-how many similar cases have been reported in literature? Please add in introduction or discussion.

<Answer>

- Thank you for your comment. Eccrine hidradenoma of the breast is very rare, and only 14 cases have been reported in English literature. We added that in the discussion

2-did the authors request MRI for patient? If yes, please add the findings and images to paper.

<Answer>

- MRI was not performed for this patient. In our institution, we usually do not perform breast MRI for patients with benign lesion.

3-what was the sono-BIRADS score of patient?

<Answer>

- The mass showed complex solid and cystic, hypervascular, hard mass on ultrasonography, we assessed the mass as BI-RADS category 4b.

4-what was the surgical method? Complete excision of mass? Please clarify in paper?

<Answer>

- Complete excision of mass was performed to exclude malignancy

5-why the authors ascribed BIRADS 5 to lesion? [as the mass was oval shape and circumscribed margin

<Answer>

- We modified BI-RADS category 5 to category 4b
- Although the shape and margin of mass were favoring benign mass, it was newly developed in a postmenopausal woman and showed intra-tumoral microcalcifications on

mammography and complex solid and cystic, hypervascular, hard mass on ultrasonography, we assessed the mass as BI-RADS category 4b

Reviewer 2:

Dear AE

Thanks for inviting me to review the case report.

As you know, Eccrine hidradenoma is a rare and an interesting case,especially in breast skin, from the pathological point of view.However, it is obvious from the clinical and imaging findings that the patient's mass is a dermal lesion that cannot be named as a highly suggestive malignant breast lesion (BIRADS category :5).The mass is superficial,has an air-tissue interface and shows bening type calcifications . I reviewed the literature and found out that the clinical presentationis usually suggestive of a benign lesion. Anyway gathering the imaging findings of an Eccrine hidradenoma is interesting enough to report it after changing the topic to"imaging findings of an Eccrine hidradenoma on breast skin and revising the reports of the images.

<Answer>

Thank you for your comment.

The mass did not appear to be a dermal lesion on mammography or ultrasound. Ultrasonography clearly shows that the mass is located deeper away from the skin layer. And the intratumoral calcification shows suspicious morphology. The overlapping benign type calcification is not in the mass. We added a MLO view of mammography to prove it. The imaging findings were not seen as a dermal lesion, but the pathologic result was skin origin tumor, so we think this case was considered to be an interesting case to report.

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.

Madjid Shakiba: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 6 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The study is reviewed carefully. According to comments and revisions by the author, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 15 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The author(s)has revised the manuscript.
I believe the case is an interesting one. It can be accepted as a letter to editor.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 24 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
The case report is relevant and acceptable. It should be controlled for plagiarism.
MR images are not available.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 24 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript could be accepted.
Thanks.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 27 Feb 2020

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

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 29 Feb 2020

Dear authors,

Your article is acceptable for the publication in IJR.

Regards