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.96718
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(2); e96718

Peer Review Report for "Use of Low-dose Chest CT Scan in the Evaluation of Breast Composition According to the Recommendations of BI-RADS Atlas-Fifth Edition"

Author(s): Feng Ao, Xueguo Liu, Mingzhu Liang, Jiebing Gao

Review Timeline:

Submit Date:	29 Jul 2019
Revised Date:	15 Apr 2020
Accepted Date:	20 Apr 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)

3 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
Although the researchers attempted to design and execute this study in a good quality manner, from the methodological point of view, the following points need to be considered:
1. The abstract must be written in line with the journal author guideline.
2. In the abstract method, it is better firstly mentioned about study type that was a cross-sectional study.
3. In the abstract method, the time span of the study must be mentioned as calendar time.
4. In the abstract method, the study place must be written.
5. Interpretation of this result "With advancing age, the probability of non-dense breasts increased, while the probability of dense breasts decreased"; Since your study was cross-sectional and patients were not follow up; therefore, cannot speak about risk relation with age and so must be deleted this sentence in all part of the manuscript.
6.Statistical analysis: In this part, firstly must be written about descriptive measures for quantitative and qualitative variables.
7. Results:
7.1. Results must be presented according to order that mentioned in statistical analysis

7.2. The outputs of Kappa must be presented in a table.
7.3. Firstly, must be presented the demographic and clinical characteristics of the patient in table 1.
8. Some detailed comments annexed in the manuscript file.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 20 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The authors have presented an interesting study, however the text is not structured based on IJR guideline and all figures and tables should be presented at the end of text after references.
Also it is better to put most of the data in 2nd paragraph of result in a table and in this way it will be more understandable.
In legend of table 2 it is not clear what the type 1 is. Do you mean none-dense type breasts? Please first define type 1 in the method or correct it in the legend.
Based on the study results, the authors cannot conclude “low-dose chest CT scan for screening breast cancers in women with breast density categories A and B is useful“. Non dedicated CT scan is not suitable for evaluation of micro-calcifications. Also the study was not designed to evaluate of accuracy of CT in breast cancer detection. Please correct the conclusion in the abstract and the text.
Thanks.

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

Dear Authors,
According to the reviewers your article needs Major Revision.
Regards

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 reviewers of Iranian Journal of Radiology

Thank you very much for your seriously reading and revision. We were glad to hear from you and had read the comments one by one.

1. The abstract has been written in line with journal author guideline.

2. In the abstract method, we have mentioned that this study was a cross-sectional study.

3. In the abstract method, the time span of the study has been mentioned as calendar time.

4. In the abstract method, study place has been written.

5. The result "With advancing age, the probability of non-dense breasts increased, while the probability of dense breasts decreased" has been modified.

6.Statistical analysis: The descriptive measures for quantitative and qualitative variables has been added.

7. Results:

7.1. Results has be presented according to order that mentioned in statistical analysis

7.2. The outputs of Kappa has be presented.

7.3. The demographic and clinical characteristics of the patient in table 1 has been presented properly.

8. The detailed comments annexed in the manuscript file has been adopted.

9.The tables in the manuscript has been adjusted.

10. It was defined in the manuscript that type 1 in tables means none-dense type breasts.

11. According to the suggestion, the conclusion in the abstract and the text has been corrected.

We deeply appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and we look forward to receiving comments from the reviewers again. If you have any queries, please don’t hesitate to contact me at the address below.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

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) — 23 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Currently, can be said that the recommended comment applied properly; but, some points must be considered as follows:
1. All numbers in the manuscript (text and tables) must be written with some decimal number.
2. The statistical test criterion value should not be presented in the results and tables.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 17 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
Unfortunately, the article is not suitable for publication in IJR.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 17 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
All requested revisions have been done well and now it can be accepted.
Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 25 Jan 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 reviewers of Iranian Journal of Radiology

Thank you very much for your seriously reading and revision. We were glad to hear from you and had read the comments one by one.

1. All numbers in the manuscript (text and tables) have be written with same decimal number.

2. The statistical test criterion value has been deleted in the results and tables.

We deeply appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and we look forward to receiving comments from the reviewers again. If you have any queries, please don’t hesitate to contact me at the address below.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

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) — 12 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks from deer authors for applying the recommended comments and editions. Currently, this manuscript is ok according to methodologically and acceptable for publication.
Thanks.

Masoumeh Gity: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 7 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
After proper changes and based on reviewers' opinion the manuscript is acceptable for publication in IJR.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 10 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
Please the authors respond to all comments one by one. Then, highlight any changes they make in the manuscript.
1- In the affiliations, please add the hospital name if applicable.
2- In figure 5, “Both radiologists were confident about the mass detected on the CT scan (5e) and the mammogram (5f).” It seems that e is the mammogram and f is the CT scan. Please revise and confirm.
Thank you.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 11 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.

Dear reviewers and editor of Iranian Journal of Radiology

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. We appreciate the editor and reviewers very much for their constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled .

We have studied reviewers' comments carefully. According to the reviewers' detailed suggestions, we have made a careful revision on the original manuscript. All revised portions are marked in red in the revised manuscript which we would like to submit for your kind consideration.

1. The hospital name "The 5th Affiliated Hospital of Sun Yat-sen University"has been added，and it is the whole hospital name.

2. In figure 5, the order of "5e" and "5f" has been corrected.

We deeply appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and we look forward to receiving comments from the reviewers again. If you have any queries, please don't hesitate to contact me at the address below.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely.

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.

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (3) 20 Apr 2020

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

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (3) 20 Apr 2020

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