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.98754
Published in: Iranian Journal of Radiology: 17(2); e98754

Peer Review Report for "Comparison on the Use of Spinal (Stylet) Needle and Simple Needle in Ultrasound Guided Thyroid Nodule FNA; Does the Needle Affect Thyroid FNA Result?"

Author(s): Alireza Aziz Ahari, Mohammad Ali Mohammadi Vajari, Navid Khatibi Moghadam, Hassan Hashemi, Mahmoud Parvin, Mohammadreza Khaleghi

Review Timeline:

- Submit Date: 8 Oct 2019
- Revised Date: 5 Feb 2020
- Accepted Date: 21 Mar 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) 30 Oct 2019

Dear AE
Since, in this study the researchers try to compare between two methods of FNA according to some measures and can be said it is relative appropriate study for evaluation of existing situation. But, according to methodologically view of point, some comments are annexed in the manuscript that must be considered as follows:
1. Title must be indicative of the aim of the study.
2. The objective of study must be written more clearly. For example, you want to compare the results of A and B methods according to agreement between them, or you want to compare each of the results with pathology as gold standard or you want to do both of them.
3. Abstract result: "The result is 63.5% (99 subjects) of the participants which FNA obtained by needle B, was introduced as a better sample by the pathologist (P-value <0.001). " The results of A method must be presented.
4. All figures of manuscript must be written with some decimal number.
5. Methods

5.1. Must be presented according to subtitles.
5.2. Must be mentioned what test was used.
5.3. Must be mentioned each statistical test and measure was used for what purpose(s).
5.4. Any results that presented must be described them in the method section.
6. Title of tables and figure must be self-explanatory.
7. Table 1: Similar to age number must be mentioned this figure is count or …
Thanks.

Hashem Sharifian: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 12 Nov 2019

Dear AE,
Techniques to improve FNA results are very useful in practice and so this article is suitable for publishing in IJR. No significant problem in study design and results is noted.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 15 Nov 2019

Dear EIC,
The article needs minor revision
With best regards

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 16 Nov 2019

Dear authors,
Your article needs minor 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 editor-in-chief

1. The title was changed to “Comparison on the use of spinal (stylet) needle and simple needle in ultrasound guided thyroid nodules FNA; Can the Needle affect thyroid FNA result?” according to reviewers’ comment.

2. The objective of study was revised and clarified. Both of the subjects mentioned by reviewers were the aims of the study and mentioned in *objectives* section.
3. The results of A method also is presented.
4. All figures of manuscript are revised.
5. Methods
    a. Three subtitles are now added to Method section and Method is now presented according to subtitles.” Study design, FNA method, Pathological and statistical evaluation”
    b. SPSS 16 software and chi-squared test were used and mentioned in Methods section.
    c. Chi-squared test was used for all the statistical analysis.
    d. All results are described now in method section.
6. Titles of tables and Figure caption are revised.
7. Table 1 is revised according to reviewer comment.

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) — 9 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for appropriately applying the subtle comments and revisions. Currently, can be said the manuscript is acceptable according to the methodological view of the point.
Thanks.

Hashem Sharifian: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 10 Jan 2020

Dear AE,
I think most of problems are revised and now the article can be published in the journal.
Thanks.

Leila Aghaghazvini: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 13 Jan 2020

Dear EIC,
The article was reviewed by 2 reviewers and according their comments can be accepted with minor revision:
The authors should present the conclusion part clearly in abstract and text to clarify the exact results and recommendation. If anybody wants to conclude, he could not determine which needle is better.
with best regards

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 13 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 editor-in-chief

The conclusion of the study is clearly presented in abstract section and the conclusion of the study is revised.

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.

Leila Aghaghazvini: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 3 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The article was reviewed and could be accepted.
with best regards

Mehranoosh Dolatshahi: Associate Editor | **Revision** (2) — 1 Mar 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 to the authors' affiliations if applicable.
2- In the Abstract, Methods, please add the manufacturer's characteristics for SPSS software.
3- Please add objectives before Methods in the body of the manuscript.
4- In the Methods, "This study did not impair health services".
This is not clear. Please clarify.
5- In the discussion, "In the Cappelli et al. study, sampling was only done using complex nodules."
Please add reference number to this sentence.
Thank you.

Kavous Firouznia: EIC | **Revision** (2) — 2 Mar 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 editor-in-chief

Thank you for your kind guidance and comments, as you have mentioned

1. Hospital name is added to authors' affiliations.
2. Manufacture's characteristics for SPSS is added and highlighted in Abstract and Methods part according to "*How to cite IBM SPSS Statistics or earlier versions of SPSS*"
3. Objectives is added in body of the manuscript before method section.
4. *"This study did not impair health services"* is deleted and clarified with *"The patient's refusal to participate in the study does not interfere with the process of their treatment."*
5. Reference number (10) is also added in discussion part.

All changes are highlighted in yellow as you mentioned.

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) 18 Mar 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) 21 Mar 2020

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