

September 15, 2022.

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: Manuscript NO: 78598-Revised manuscript.doc).

**Title:** Diagnostic Efficacy of Diffusion, Semiquantitative and Quantitative Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging in Salivary Gland Tumors

**Authors:** Erkan Gokce, Murat Beyhan

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Radiology*

**Manuscript NO:** 78598

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of editor and reviewers

Sincerely.

**Erkan Gokce**, MD, Professor,

Radiology Department, University of Gaziosmanpaşa,

Kaleardı Quarter, Muhittin Fisunoglu Street, 60100,

Tokat, Turkey.

drerkangokce@gmail.com

Telephone: +90-542-3798986 Fax: +90-362-2309105

**Reviewer #1:**

*Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)*

*Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)*

*Conclusion: Accept (General priority)*

*Specific Comments to Authors: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes. 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes. 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes. 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes. Combined use of multi-parameter MRI including DWI and DCE-MRI could improve the diagnostic accuracy for salivary gland tumors. 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. The authors used the quantitative MRI parameters including ADC, K<sub>trans</sub>, K<sub>ep</sub>, and V<sub>e</sub>, and semiquantitative perfusion MRI evaluation for salivary gland tumors. The differences of quantitative parameters and perfusion curve characteristics among different salivary gland tumors were presented. 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes. This study can enrich our understanding of multi parameter MRI including DWI and DCE-MRI in the diagnosis of salivary gland tumors. This article well demonstrates the methods of data measurement and analysis using DWI and DCE-MRI. 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Good. 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes. 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important*

*and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Good. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Good. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes*

**Answers for Reviewer 1:**

Dear Reviewer;

Thank you very much for your positive criticism of our work and our article.

Sincerely...

**Reviewer #2:**

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

*Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Major revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors: 1. Similar studies were found in PubMed. Authors shall cite part of them and discuss what is new and different from this article: MRI[TI] AND Salivary Gland Tumors[TI] 2. This article is not registered though it is retrospective. 3. The language needs revision by a native speaker, accompanied with a certificate of language editing service and a manuscript with tracked editing records as a Suppl. 4. There are some spelling mistakes and format errors, e.g. the typesetting is chaotic. 5. The discussion is not in-depth, limitation is lack, and the clinical implications shall also be added. 6. the references style is incorrect. 7. Provide supporting references for Section Methods, especially mentioning doses, time, etc. 8. State  $n = ?$  in Section Statistical analysis and all figure legends. 9. A graphic abstract is needed to add as a main figure or Suppl figure. 10. Please provide a duplicate check report by authors as a supplementary file (< 25%).*

**Answers for Reviewer 2:**

Dear reviewer,

1. As the reviewer noted, there are similar articles on Pubmed. However, the majority of these articles are on the effectiveness of DWI and/or semi-quantitative DCE MR in salivary gland tumors. For this reason, we think that our study will contribute to the literature since it is a study that measures the effectiveness of all three methods. This point was also emphasized in our study.
2. In the first sentence of the MATERIALS AND METHODS/Patients section of the article, it was stated that the study was retrospective and was approved by the local ethics committee. In addition, "Manuscript Type: Retrospective Study" was chosen as the article format of this journal while uploading the article.

3. The certificate that the pre-revision version of the article was edited by the professional language editing service was previously submitted to the journal. In line with the reviewer's suggestion, the article was reviewed by someone with native speaker level English knowledge and skills, and a manuscript with tracked editing records as a supplement was submitted.
4. Spelling errors have been corrected in line with the reviewer's suggestions.
5. In line with the reviewer's suggestions, new references were added to the discussion and the limitations section was expanded.
6. The references style is re-arranged according to the rules of the journal.
7. It has been added to the method section with the reference that Tofts kinetic model [16] is used for the measurement of Quantitative perfusion DCE-MRI parameters.
8. The n values are added to the statistics data and figure legends.
9. In line with the reviewer's suggestion, the work flow chart has been added to the article as Figure 1.
10. A duplicate check report (iThenticate checker) has been added as a supplementary file by the authors.

Sincerely...

**(1) Science editor:**

*The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

## **Answering for Science Editor:**

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your positive criticism of our work and our article. Based on your suggestion, the article has been reviewed and edited by a native speaker of English in terms of Language.

Sincerely...

## **(2) Company Editor-in-Chief**

*I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Radiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright*

*information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.*

### **Answering for Company Editor-in-Chief**

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your positive criticism of our work and our article. All figures of our article (Manuscript NO.: 78598) are original. All figures are obtained in our department. All figures used in the article are presented in the form of a power point file, arranged according to the features you want. Tables are arranged in accordance with the format of the journal. References obtained using RCA have been added to the article and the discussion has been enhanced.

Sincerely...