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.96419
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(1); e96419

Peer Review Report for "Non-Invasive Monitoring of HER2 Expression in Breast Cancer Patients with ^{99m}Tc-Affibody SPECT/CT"

Author(s): Jiong Cai, Xin Li, Feng Mao, Pan Wang, Yaping Luo, Kun Zheng, Fang Li, Zhaohui Zhu

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Jul 2019
Revised Date: 16 Nov 2019
Accepted Date: 27 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) — 19 Aug 2019

Dear AE,
Methodologically, this article is well designed, implemented, analyzed, and written.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 25 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The paper "Non-invasive monitoring of HER2 expression in breast cancer patients with 99mTc-affibody SPECT/CT" has studied a new and interesting imaging agent to assist in better management of breast cancer. The steps of performing this study are all well accomplished and the paper is well written. I consider this paper of value and acceptable to be published in your esteemed journal.
Yours sincerely,

ALI ARABKHERADMAND: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 8 Oct 2019

Dear AE,

Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) is associated with high-grade breast tumors, high rates of lymph-node involvement, high risk of recurrence, and high resistance to general chemotherapy. Analysis of HER2 expression is highly important for doctors to identify patients who can benefit from trastuzumab therapy and monitor the response and efficacy of treatment. Earlier investigations showed successful imaging of HER2-positive tumors in patients using indium- or gallium-labeled Affibody molecules. The goal of this study was to evaluate the use of 99mTc-labeled Affibody molecules for the detection of HER2 expression.These advances in HER2 imaging may be a step toward a new “Image and Treat” strategy in breast cancer patients.
Thanks.

Masoumeh Gity: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 13 Oct 2019

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

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision (0)** 30 Oct 2019

Dear EIC,
The author may respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes he makes in the manuscript.
1- In the introduction, “The technological approach of radiolabeled affibody has been used to detect HER2-positive cancer using the SPECT and positron emission computed tomography (PET) [18-24], which permits HER2 imaging in animal models and human subjects using 111In for SPECT and 68Ga, 18F for PET within 24 hours of administering the radiolabeled probe [28-30, 36, 37].
What is the superscript 111 stand for? Please clarify.
2- Please mention references in the text in correct order You have mentioned 30 and then 36.
Please check the whole manuscript and make sure references are in order and then change the references in the list accordingly.
3- Please rewrite the figure legend for fig 2 so that parts are explained in order and clearly.
4- Please add an explanation about fig 3 C in the text.
5- Please mention figures in the text respectively. You have mentioned fig 2 before you completely mentioned different parts of fig 1.
6- Please add fig 4 after fig 3 in the text.
7- There are 8 patients (scored as HER2 2+) in table 2.(including four FISH positive patients and four FISH negative patients), but you have mentioned 7 in the text. Please clarify.
8- There are 8 patients (HER2 negative) in table2, but you have mentioned nine. Please clarify.
Thank you.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision (0)** 2 Nov 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 (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.

1- *In the introduction, "The technological approach of radiolabeled affibody has been used to detect HER2-positive cancer using the SPECT and positron emission computed tomography (PET) [18-24], which permits HER2 imaging in animal models and human subjects using 111In for SPECT and 68Ga , 18F for PET within 24 hours of administering the radiolabeled probe [28-30, 36, 37].*
What is the superscript 111 stand for? Please clarify.

Reply: Superscript 111 stand for relative atomic mass of radioactive isotope Indium

2-Please mention references in the text in correct order You have mentioned 30 and then 36.
Please check the whole manuscript and make sure references are in order and then change the references in the list accordingly.

Reply: References are made in order and changed in the list accordingly.

3-Please rewrite the figure legend for fig 2 so that parts are explained in order and clearly.

Reply: The figure legend for fig 2 "HER2 immunohistochemistry of IDC patient No. 22 (B) and ILC patient No. 8 (D) showing a negative (-) pattern of staining that were both negative by SPECT imaging with the 99mTc-labeled affibody (A: No. 22; C: No. 8)." was rewrite as "The negative image (A) in SPECT with ^{99m}Tc-labeled affibody in breast cancer lesion of a IDC patient (No.22) showed negative pattern of staining in HER2 immunohistochemistry (B); A patient (No. 8) diagnosed as ILC also displayed negative uptake with ^{99m}Tc-labeled affibody (C) and matched negative HER2 expression (D)."

4-Please add explanation about fig 3 C in text.

Reply: The explanation about fig 3 C was added in text.

5-Please mention figures in the text respectively. You have mentioned fig 2 before you completely mentioned different parts of fig 1.

Reply: The part case analysis with Fig 1 was completely removed to part of the Evaluation of patients with suspected breast cancer, and the figures were mentioned in the text respectively.

6-Please add fig 4 after fig 3 in the text.

Reply: Fig 2s was changed to fig 4 and added after fig 3 in the text.

7- There are 8 patients (scored as HER2 2+) in table 2.(including four FISH positive patients and four FISH negative patients), but you have mentioned 7 in the text. Please clarify.

Reply: The error was corrected.

8- There are 8 patients (HER2 negative) in table2, but you have mentioned

nine. Please clarify.

Thank you.

Reply: The error was corrected.

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.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision (1)** 11 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The author may respond to the mentioned comment. Then, highlight any changes he makes in the manuscript.
- In figure legend 3, part C has been mentioned before B. In the manuscript, the same has happened. Please mention parts of figure 3 in order and then change it in the legend too.
Thank you.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision (1)** 12 Nov 2019

Dear authors,
Your article needs minor revision in the figures.
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.

In figure legend 3, part C has been mentioned before B. In the manuscript the same has happened. Please mention parts of figure 3 in order and then change it in the legend too.

REPLY: The figure 3 and manuscript have been changed in order.

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) 27 Nov 2019

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

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (2) 27 Nov 2019

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