Journal of Clinical Research in Paramedical Sciences
Volume 11 · Issue 2 · e131621

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Co-authorship Network Analysis of Medical Images Researchers with Emphasis on Micro and Macro Metrics

Farideh Osareh, Saleh Salehi-Zahabi, Farideh Akbarzadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
14 Sep 2022	24 Oct 2022	6 Nov 2022	10.5812/jcrps-131621

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Faramarz Soheili, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6

1 Original submission

3 comments · 14 Oct 2022 – 15 Oct 2022

Faramarz Soheili Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 14 Oct 2022

In the abstract section, it is mentioned that the network is cohesive, but the density of the network is 7%. Does 7% indicate the coherence of the network?
Choose keywords that represent the title and subject of the research.
It is necessary to use up-to-date resources to strengthen the introduction.
The research method is not clearly defined. This must be specified.
The validity and reliability of the data and tools should be determined. How are the micro and macro metrics of the network calculated?
The type of matrix used, the threshold points, and how the diagonal cells of the matrix are handled should be described. Determine whether the correlation matrix was used or not.
The content of the tables does not correspond to the explanations below them. For example, the explanation below table 1 mentions the average clustering coefficient and states its value, but neither this value nor this index is included in the table.
In the conclusion section, it is necessary to explain the reasons, not to repeat the findings.
In dissociation, comparisons should be made with cases that are relevant to this research.
In the conclusion section, new indicators have been presented that were not in the findings section and related tables and figures. The conclusion should be based on the findings of the research, rather than describing new indicators in this section.
The research suggestion should be practical and based on the findings of this research, not the researcher's ideal.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 15 Oct 2022

Minor Revision

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 15 Oct 2022

Minor Revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Respected Editor-in-Chief

Respected reviewers of the article

With greetings and respect;

With thanks for the efforts of the respected reviewers of the article, we hereby inform you that, given the word limit of 3500 words for the article and 250 words for the abstract, and also the author's effort to avoid increasing the number of words in accordance with the journal policy, the corrections and comments of the respected reviewers have been applied as follows:

1. The aim written in the abstract is telegraphic. The main problem is not stated in the abstract, nor what reason there was for addressing this problem, and whether there is a need for this research to be carried out. Corrected, given the word limit.
2. The conclusion is debatable; you must look further for the cause and effect of the work, although this has been addressed to some extent in the Discussion . But the conclusion of the work is important. Corrected.
3. The titles of the tables and figures should be written uniformly. Corrected.
4.. The indices of the table should be defined in the footnote. Given the word limit, the explanation of the table indices is given in the Introduction.
5.. The maps should be zoomed in. Corrected.
6. The Introduction contains too much material; instead, the research problem and its necessity should be addressed. Corrected.
7. In the research method, the reason for using wos instead of Medline should be written. Added.

in the abstract section, it is mentioned that the network is cohesion, but the density of the network is 7%, does 7% indicate the coherence of the network?

What was meant by the sentence is that the density of the said network in this time period was higher compared with the two other periods. The wording of the sentence was corrected.

Choose keywords that represent the title and subject of the research

The keywords were selected based on MeSH according to the journal policy.

It is necessary to use up-to-date resources to strengthen the introduction

An attempt was made to use the most recent references. However, in 3 cases, the author used articles from before 2010 because of their content. As far as possible, two references were replaced and corrected.

The research method is not clearly defined. This must be specified.
Validity and reliability of data and tools should be determined.

Corrected.

How to calculate the micro and macro metrics of the network.
The type of matrix used, the thresholds point and how to deal with the diagonal cells of the matrix should be described. Determine whether the correlation matrix was used or not.

Corrected.

There is no proportionality between the content of the tables and the explanations below, for example, in table 1 the average clustering coefficient is mentioned and its value is stated, while in the content of the table, this number and this index are not stated.

Corrected.

In the conclusion part, it is necessary to answer the reasons, not to repeat the findings. In the conclusion section, new indicators have been passed that were not in the findings section and related tables and figures. The conclusion should be based on the findings of the research, not that new indicators are described in this section .In dissociation, the comparison should be made with cases that are relevant to this research.

In the Discussion, an attempt was made to compare the results while also stating the reasons. However, for some findings, despite searching and follow-up, no research relevant to the field under study was found for comparison. The Discussion and Conclusion were revised and corrections were added.

The research suggestion should be practical and based on the findings of this research, not the researcher's ideal

Corrected.

With thanks for the efforts of the respected Editor-in-Chief and reviewers

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 6 Nov 2022 – 6 Nov 2022

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 6 Nov 2022

Accept

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 6 Nov 2022

Accept