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://brief.land/briefland/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Iranian Journal of Radiology
Article DOI: 10.5812/iranjradiol.93321
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(1); e93321

# Peer Review Report for "Diagnostic Imaging Findings and Endovascular Treatment of Patients Presented with Abdominal Pain Caused by Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection"

**Author(s):** Abdala Maulid Mkangala, Huimin Liang, Xiang Jun Dong, Yangbo Su, Luo Haohao

**Review Timeline:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Submit Date: | 11 May 2019 |
| Revised Date: | 5 Nov 2019 |
| Accepted Date: | 12 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) — 10 Jun 2019

Dear AE,
Since the outcome is rare, the study on it is interesting with the use of registration system data and can help to create the hypothesis of the etiology. But statistical analysis of the study was not carried out correctly and in this regard, comments were made in the manuscript that needs to be applied. Moreover, some other detailed comments are provided in the manuscript for consideration.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 15 Jul 2019

Dear AE,
This paper is a valuable paper and i accept it.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 4 Aug 2019

Dear EIC,
In the reviewers' opinion, this manuscript is proper for publication.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 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.

To: Prof. Kavous Firouznia
Editor-in-Chief
Iranian Journal of Radiology
August 10, 2019

Dear Prof. Firouznia

Re: **Submission of revised manuscript ID: 93321**

We thank you and your team for your email we received on August 5, 2019, attached with the reviewers' comments. As a team of authors, we have carefully reviewed all the comments and we have conducted minor revision in our manuscript accordingly.

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript Diagnostic Imaging Findings and Endovascular Treatment of Patients Presented with Abdominal Pain Caused by Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection which we would like to resubmit for publication consideration in Iranian Journal of Radiology. Our responses are given in a one by one and point-by-point reviewer comments respond addressed below. Newly added sentences to the manuscript are shown in text highlight with yellow color in our resubmitted revised manuscript word file.

All comments from the reviewers were highly insightful and enabled us to add key points for the improvement of the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewers.

In accordance with reviewer number 1 comments, we inserted a sentence in sub-section "Statistic" in the Methods section to address the issue.

***"In this current study due to limited data set in our disposal, the conduction and analysis of statistical tests were not carried out."***

Furthermore, in sub-section "Limitation" in the Discussion section, we modified one of our limitation sentences in order to address the raised concerned.

***"Also, it was a single-institute study with a relatively small number of patients for conducting and analyzing statistical tests."***

We are in great hope that the revisions provided in the revised manuscript and our point-by-point responses will be sufficient for our manuscript to be considered for publication in the Iranian Journal of Radiology

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

## RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

**Reviewer 1**

Comments:

*Since the outcome is rare, the study on it is interesting with the use of registration system data and can help to create the hypothesis of the etiology.* ***"But statistical analysis of the study was not carried out correctly and in this regard, comments were made in the manuscript that needs to be applied."*** *Moreover, some other detailed comments are provided in the manuscript for consideration.*

Response:

**Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript as well as for your comments. We really appreciate the time you took to go through it and we find your highly insightful comment to be very helpful. We are glad to inform you that we revised our manuscript according to your comment and we added two sentences one in the Statistic sub-section and another sentence in Limitation subsection in order to address your concerned. In this regard, we would like to point out that our study limitation was the data set which hindering us to perform a further statistical test.**

**However, in our methodology, we pointed out all of our 31 patients received a bare self-expandable stent and the primary success rate of 100% (n=31) was recorded during mean fasting and follow-up time of 4.9±1.9 days and 15.5±4.8 months respectively. Given this set of data, we still believe descriptive statistics is appropriate to report our various variables based on the measures of central tendency and variability. Furthermore, we will consider more broad statistical test analysis in the future publication based on the availability of a large number of data. Overall we would like to thank you for your outstanding comment in this section and we hope our revised manuscript and response to your comment may adequately**

**address your concern, in case more response is needed we are looking forward to hearing from you.**

**Reviewer 2:**

Comment: *“This paper is a valuable paper and I accept it.”*

Response: **Thank you for accepting our work. We highly appreciate your time and effort during the whole process. We really appreciate your comment and we find it to be very encouraging.**

**Associate Editor:**

Comment: *“In the reviewer's opinion this manuscript is proper for publication”*

Response: **Thank you A.E for taking our manuscript into consideration. Thank you very much for your suggestion. We really appreciate the time you took to think about it and we thank you for that.**

**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) — 17 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
This article is currently relatively acceptable for publication, but some comments, such as the complete expression of words in the first place such as SMA, CT, CTA, or do not use of numbers at the beginning of the sentence, were not made.
Thanks.

**REFEREE**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 22 Sep 2019

Dear EIC,
According to manuscript ID: 93321; Title: DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING FINDINGS AND ENDOVASCULAR TREATMENT OF PATIENTS PRESENTED WITH ABDOMINAL PAIN CAUSED BY SPONTANEOUS ISOLATED SUPERIOR MESENTERIC ARTERY DISSECTION [Revision 1 ]
the authors revised the manuscript completely.
Thanks.

**Mehranoosh Dolatshahi**: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 28 Oct 2019

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) — 30 Oct 2019

Dear authors,
According to the reviewers 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.

To: Prof. Kavous Firouznia
Editor-in-Chief
Iranian Journal of Radiology
November 3rd, 2019

Dear Prof. Firouznia

Re: **Submission of revised manuscript ID: 93321**

We thank you and your team for your email we received on October 30, 2019, attached with the **reviewer 1, associate editor 1 and 2 comments.** As a team of authors, we have carefully reviewed all the comments and we have conducted minor revision in our manuscript accordingly.

With this letter please find attached a revised version of our manuscript **Diagnostic Imaging Findings and Endovascular Treatment of Patients Presented with Abdominal Pain Caused by Spontaneous Isolated Superior Mesenteric Artery Dissection** which we would like to resubmit for publication consideration in **Iranian Journal of Radiology**. Our responses are given in a one by one and point-by-point reviewer comments respond as addressed below our letter. Changes made to the manuscript are shown in text highlight with yellow color in our resubmitted revised manuscript word file.

All comments from the reviewer and associate editors were tremendously insightful with an informed impact on the improvement of the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewer and associate editors.

We anticipated the correction that has been carried out in the revised manuscript and our point-by-point responses might be sufficient for our manuscript to be considered for publication in the Iranian Journal of Radiology.

We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you.

## RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

***Reviewer 1:***

**Comments:**

Hi Dear Authors

This article is currently relatively acceptable for publication, but some comments, such as the complete expression of words in the first place such as SMA, CT, CTA or do not use of number at the beginning of the sentence, were not made.

**Response:**

***Thank you very much for the work you have done in making sure our manuscript is improved to the international standard level. We really appreciate your constructive recommendation that you have pointed out. We have work on all of your recommendation as per your instructions. All corrections regarding abbreviation and sentence beginning with a number were made.***

***Associate Editor 1:***

**Comments:**

Dear editorial
According to manuscript ID: 93321; Title: DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING FINDINGS AND ENDOVASCULAR TREATMENT OF PATIENTS PRESENTED WITH ABDOMINAL PAIN CAUSED BY SPONTANEOUS ISOLATED SUPERIOR MESENTERIC ARTERY DISSECTION [Revision 1 ]the authors revised the manuscript completely

**Response:**

***We thank you for taking our manuscript into consideration. We highly appreciate your time and effort during the whole process.***

***Associate Editor 2:***

Dear author,

Please respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes you make in the manuscript. Please do not make any changes in the manuscript other than responding to the comments, because they will not be considered.

**Comments and Responses**

***Dear associate editor 2***

***Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript as well as for your comments. We really appreciate the time you took to go through it and we find your comment to be very helpful. We are glad to inform you that we revised our manuscript according to your comments and we made some significant changes as you point out. All changes can be seen written in text highlight with yellow color in our resubmitted revised manuscript word file***

**Comments 1:**

1-In the abstract, “results”, 90.3% has been mentioned. After this number, there is a 9. Please clarify what this number 9 means.

**Response:**

***This was a typing error hence we corrected our mistake by removing the number “9” in that sentence.***

**Comments 2:**

2-References in the manuscript should be mentioned in correct order. You have mentioned 1 to 9 and then 12. And also you have mentioned reference 16 and then 18. Please add the missing references in the text and then change references in the list of references accordingly. Check all referencing in the whole manuscript so there are no discrepancies.

**Response:**

***In responding to the above comment, we review all of our references and countercheck with the corresponding numbers in the text of our manuscript. We agreed with your outstanding observations that from reference number "1" to "9" there was no problem, all the numbers in the text and in reference series number were correct. We observe and correct the reference number from number "10" onwards. We rearranged the number and come up with the new reference numbers in the text numbering and in reference number from 10 to 32 in which new two references were added.***

***Reference numbers in the following box are changed from previous position to current position***

| previous reference no | currently reference no: |
|---|---|
| 12 | 10 |
| 10 | 11 |
| 11 | 12 |
| 13 | Remain the same |
| 14 | Sakamoto et al. |
| 15 | Yun et al. |
| 14 | 16 |
| 15 | 17 |
| 18 | 19 |
| 19 | 20 |
| 20 | 21 |
| 21 | 22 |
| 22 | 23 |
| 23 | 24 |
| 24 | 25 |
| 25 | 26 |
| 26 | 27 |
| 27 | 28 |
| 17 | 29 |
| 28 | 30 |
| 29 | 31 |
| 30 | 32 |

**Comments 3:**

3-You have mentioned Sakamoto et al. as reference 11 and Yun et al. as reference 12. None of them are right. Please avoid cross referencing

and address references in the manuscript and the list of references correctly.

**Response 3:**

***In responding to the above comment, we review all of our references and added Sakamoto and Yun as reference numbers 14 and 15 respectively.***

**Comments 4:**

4-Figure 3 is adopted from a reference. Based on journal policy, you need to mention where it is from in the references and in the figure, just as any other reference in the text. Please make sure it is addressed.

**Response:**

***This illustration was designed and drawn by the authors hence it belongs to the authors as original work. We have added (Illustrations is work of Authors) in manuscript text and in Figure 3.***

**Comments 5:**

5-In Methods, “The hospital information electronic databases results from diagnostic test and notes from the health care provider were reviewed for all patients who had SISMAD diagnosis according to CTA imaging results between 2007 and 2017.”

Do you mean, “The hospital electronic database results were reviewed for all patients who had SISMAD diagnosis according to CTA imaging results between 2007 and 2017.”?

Please clarify.

**Response:**

***Our aim was to state that, we reviewed all patients with the diagnosis of SISMAD that was admitted in our hospital between 2007 and 2017. The information should be balanced***

***by reviewing electronic, non-electronics patient's information as well as radiological results. With your help, we rewrite our sentence and now it will be as follows.***

***"The hospital electronic database results were reviewed for all patients who had SISMAD diagnosis according to clinical and radiological imaging findings between 2007 and 2017."***

**Comments 6:**

6-In the illustration of Figure 2 in "Diagnosis", you have mentioned part A then C to E. Then you have mentioned B. Please mention different parts of Figure 2 in correct order in the manuscript. Figure 2F should be mentioned before Figure 3.

**Response:**

***The correction was carried out and the new arrangement is as follows: [Figure 2-A], [Figure 2-B]. [Figure 2-C], [Figure 2-D&E] and [Figure 2-F].***

**Comments 7:**

7- In figure 2, you have mentioned part 2F after you have mentioned figure 3. Figures should be mentioned in order. First figure 2 should be mentioned and then Figure 3 A to D.

**Response:**

***The correction was carried out and the new arrangement, we first finished with Figure 2 from A to F then we continue with Figure 3 A to D.***

**Comments 8:**

8-In the discussion, "In most cases, atherosclerosis, medial cystic necrosis, fibromuscular dysplasia or associated with untreated hypertension." This sentence does not have a verb and is incomplete. Please rewrite.

**Response:**

***Similarly many vascular diseases, SISMAD is associated with risk factors such as smoking, diabetes, atherosclerosis, medial cystic necrosis, fibromuscular dysplasia, abnormalities of elastic fiber (Marfan syndrome and Ehlers-Danlos syndrome), trauma, as well as untreated hypertension [1,4,9].***

**Comments 9:**

9-In the discussion, “In 2000, Leung et al. [17] reported the first a case of SISMAD treated using wall stent followed by Froment [28] recommendation of stent as a preferred treatment. “ is not clear. Please clarify this sentence and rewrite.

**Response:**

***In responding to this comment we were able to come up with the solution for both comments number “9” and “10” an hence we rewrite both paragraphs and coming up with one paragraph. The main goal of the previous two paragraphs was to present the background of stent placement, success stories in the previous publication regarding stent placement, evidence-based advantages of endovascular stent placement in comparison to conservative and open surgery. The current paragraph will be as follows***

***“In 2000 Leung et al. [29] reported the first successful case of SISMAD which was treated by endovascular stent placement using a wall stent. Subsequently, Froment et al. [30] come up with the recommendation in which endovascular stent treatment was proposed as a preferred treatment of choice. Froment proposition was a result of the study they conducted in which they reported a failure rate of 38.5% among 13 asymptomatic patients who received conservative treatment, which increases to 50% in symptomatic patients. Eventually, several authors started reporting stent placement as a safe, effective, and successful treatment in the management of symptomatic SISMAD. Recently endovascular stent placement is reported as the first treatment choice with good clinical outcomes for the management of symptomatic patients or as a secondary treatment after conservative management failure***

***[9,12]. Furthermore, the indications for endovascular treatment should not only be based on the presenting symptoms or percentage of true lumen occlusion but angiographic findings and the presence of collateral circulations through SMA side braches. [31] In China, where our study originated, endovascular stent placement is considered as the first line of management for symptomatic patients. Hypothetically, in recent years endovascular provides additional advantages compared to open surgery. Endovascular treatment technically the access site is less invasive in this way reduced time of the healing process, the reduced time needed for immobilization and reduced infections. Overall endovascular treatment is more sufficiently in treating symptomatic patients with severe co-morbidities who are unfit for open surgery. [16,21,22,23].”***

**Comments 10:**

10-“In comparison to surgery, endovascular treatment is limited invasive and more sufficiently in treating symptomatic patients who present with no peritonitis signs [14], [20-22]. Recently, there is a significant increase in the number of reports where endovascular stent placement as the first choice treatment with good clinical results.”

Please rewrite this paragraph so it is understandable.

**Response:**

***In responding to your comments this section was revised and finally combined with the above comment number “9” and the two paragraphs were summarized and provide one final paragraph above.***

**Comments 11:**

11-Finally, I need to emphasize that all changes you make should be highlighted one by one. We cannot accept your manuscript until all parts are clarified and highlighted accordingly.

Thank you.

**Response:**

***We have addressed the entire requirement as per instructions and recommendations from all comments. All changes that were made are highlighted in the yellow text in the manuscript. Overall we would like to thank you for your outstanding comments in our manuscript and we hope our revised version and responses to your comments may adequately address all the concerns, in case more response is needed we are looking forward to hearing from you.***

***Thank you.***

**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) 11 Nov 2019

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

**Kavous Firouznia**: EIC | **Revision** (2) 12 Nov 2019

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