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.97807
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: In Press(In Press); e97807

Peer Review Report for "Intracranial Inflammatory Pseudotumor: A Case Report"

Author(s): Manizhe Ataee Kachuei

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Sep 2019
Revised Date: 21 Sep 2020
Accepted Date: 15 Mar 2021

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) — 22 Sep 2019

Dear AE,
The way of case presentation has been weakly organized.
Comments for the authors:
- Adding complementary exams, like serologic/immunologic tests, pathologic specimen … is required.
- Also the results of imaging and clinical follow up studies should be added.
- Interpretation of imaging studies seems to be poorly done. Based on the available sagittal images, the lesion appears T2W hyperintense and T1W isointense, containing centrally located severely hypointense foci.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 26 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,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 26 Oct 2019

Dear authors,

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

The article was revised according to your valuable stated points:

Reviewer 1: The way of case presentation has been weakly organized. - Adding complementary exams, like serologic/immunologic tests, pathologic specimen … is required. Also the results of imaging and clinical follow up studies should be added.

Serologic and biochemistry tests were skipped because the results were unremarkable and in normal range. It was added to case presentation. Also pathologic specimen details and IHC results were added too. The patient clinical status after surgery was stated in revision.

- Interpretation of imaging studies seems to be poorly done. Imaging interpretation was edited with more details.

Best 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) — 22 Sep 2020

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

Hassan Hashemi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 31 Oct 2020

Dear EIC,
This article as a case report is accepted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 15 Mar 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 15 Mar 2021

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