

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 76110

Title: Inter-reader reliability of ultrasound O-RADS risk stratification amongst less experienced readers in a North American institution before and after training

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04551037

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, MSc

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-06 07:13

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-07 20:10

Review time: 1 Day and 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 Title. Appropriate 2 Abstract. Appropriate 3 Key words. Appropriate 4
Background. Appropriate 5 Methods. Appropriate 6 Results. Appropriate 7
Discussion. Appropriate 8 Illustrations and tables. In table , the frequency of the
some errors are seen to increase after treatment, please explain/discuss the possible
causes. 9 Biostatistics. Appropriate 10 Units. Appropriate 11 References.
Appropriate 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Appropriate
13 Research methods and reporting. Appropriate 14 Ethics statements. Appropriate

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 76110

Title: Inter-reader reliability of ultrasound O-RADS risk stratification amongst less experienced readers in a North American institution before and after training

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01213211

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-07 19:08

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-15 06:16

Review time: 7 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, authors try to assess the reliability of ultrasound O-RADS risk classification amongst less experienced readers with and without pre-test training and their diagnostic accuracy. It is a well-written study. I have only few comments. Title: Appropriate. Abstract: Generally good, however, to make a conclusion about misclassification of potentially malignant lesions, training about dermoid features or wall/septation morphology, some results about them must be given in the results part of the abstract. Keywords: Not present in the manuscript file. Key results: Appropriate. Introduction: Ok Materials and methods: 1. Did authors include only one mass per patient or were there any cases with bilateral ovarian/adnexal masses? I ask this because especially for O-RADS 5 lesions, bilateral ovarian malignancy is common, and this may cause bias in assessing the contralateral mass of the patient. Please clarify this in the text. Results: 1. "Readers misclassified 22 (14.7%) of 150 lesions " This would be 100 lesions I assume. 2. According to table 1 and 3, the PPVs of R2 and R3 has decreased 14-16% for O-RADS 3 lesions after training. Do the authors have an explanation for that? What was their most common mistake in that sub-group? This could be added to the discussion. Discussion: 1. I agree with the authors that wall irregularity is the most challenging one of the descriptors, either irregularity of the inner wall or the outer contours. Did the authors do an analysis regarding the use of correct descriptors separately? Because if they all label the same but wrong descriptor, they misclassify the lesion, however interobserver variability becomes high. Therefore, did the training influence accurate definitions of descriptors on each case? This could be mentioned in the discussion part. In addition, if the authors include a such analysis, they may have an

idea on which descriptor they will emphasize much more during training. References: ok. The reference below could be added also. "Strachowski LM, Jha P, Chawla TP, Davis KM, Dove CK, Glanc P, Morgan TA, Andreotti RF. O-RADS for Ultrasound: A User's Guide, From the AJR Special Series on Radiology Reporting and Data Systems. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2021;216(5):1150-1165" Figures and tables: 1. Figure 1 and 2 may be merged.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Radiology*

Manuscript NO: 76110

Title: Inter-reader reliability of ultrasound O-RADS risk stratification amongst less experienced readers in a North American institution before and after training

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01213211

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-12

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-26 05:48

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-26 07:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks authors for their satisfactory review. I have no further comments