PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 72164

Title: Effect of training on resident inter-reader agreement with American College of Radiology Thyroid Imaging Reporting and Data System

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03540872

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Israel

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-17 15:06

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-17 16:21

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study demonstrates a statistical significant improvement in inter- reader agreement among radiology residents before and after a teaching session of ACR TIRADS compared to expert consensus. The study therfore proposes the use of dedicated training for residents as an affective mean to improve capability in interperting   thyroid nodule ultrasound . Further studies should take place comparing diagnostic improvement to pathological reference and not only expert consensus as was performed in this study.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 72164

Title: Effect of training on resident inter-reader agreement with American College of Radiology Thyroid Imaging Reporting and Data System

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05126185

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: South Korea

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2021-10-12

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-10-12 23:35

Reviewer performed review: 2021-10-21 01:55

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a excellent manuscript with an important topic, sound analysis and solid writing. Especially, you addressed very well the strengths and limitations of your study in Discussion.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This a very interesting manuscript describing inter-reader agreement of radiology residents in using the ACR-RADDS system. It is well-written, but there remain some problems (see below). Major points a) Materials and Methods: "The type of ultrasound make, model, or platform were not considered in the selection process." I cannot understand this way, because US image is largely influenced by these factors (frequency, degree of compound or smoothing, --). b) Please mention how to teach thyroid US in the training in detail. c) Please show some representative US images (good agreement, poor agreement). Minor points a) Clinical experience: three fellowship-trained staff radiologists with between 1 and 14 years. In my opinion, 1 year of clinical experience is insufficient. b) Material and Methods: What kind of disagreement was resolved by re-review?