

Peer review policy

Once a manuscript has been submitted, the following steps are followed:

1. The *Editor* assesses the submitted material for compatibility with the journal's guidelines (anonymity of authors and institution in the files that are referred to reviewers, anonymity of patient data in text and images).
2. If everything is in order, the relevant *Section Editor* is notified and sends the material to two reviewers of the appropriate field of expertise of his/her own choice. The review process is double-blinded: the reviewers do not know the manuscript's authors and the authors do not know the reviewers.
3. The reviewers are given one week to accept or decline the review invitation. If they decline, they are invited to suggest two other reviewers.
4. Once a reviewer accepts the review invitation, he/she is given a period of three weeks to submit a review. A link containing a password is given. The invitation includes a link with **Review guidelines**:
http://hjradiology.org/index.php/HJR/pages/view/guidelines#Reviewers_Guidelines.
5. The reviewer is asked to state his/her opinion about the submission and the reasons for reaching a conclusion via the journal's platform in the field "Confidential Comments to Editor". Detailed and specific comments for improvement of the paper, if appropriate, are placed by the reviewer in the field "Blind Comments to Author". The report is finalised by addressing each question about the manuscript and choosing a recommendation, according to the following choices: Accept, Decline, Revisions required. This procedure is repeated for both reviewers, who are blinded to each other's identity.
6. Once both reviewers submit their comments and recommendations, these are forwarded to the authors, who are invited to submit the revised material, provided that they can respond appropriately to the reviewers' comments. Revised material is subject again to review before a decision is finalised and acceptance for publication is not guaranteed. The comments by the reviewers are included at the foot of the message to the authors. The revised work is returned to the original reviewers. The authors are asked to specifically address all issues raised by the reviewers in a detailed, point-by-point rebuttal, making it as easy as possible for the reviewers to recognise and understand the changes made in response to their comments. If the authors disagree with specific points, they are invited to state their opinion, and this is taken into consideration. Uploading of the revised material is performed via the online submission system, as follows:
At the section "Review/Editor's Decision":
 - A blinded clean copy of the revised manuscript (without changes highlighted),At the section "Summary/Supplementary Files":
 - An updated full title page,
 - A blinded annotated copy of the manuscript (identifying the changes that were made and the corresponding reviewer comment),
 - All figures as individual TIFF files, 300 dpi resolution,
 - A detailed, point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments (Word document).The revised manuscript must be returned within two weeks of the message if the

reviewers have suggested minor corrections or four weeks in the event of major corrections.

7. If both reviewers have suggested rejection of the manuscript, this is rejected by the editor and the authors are informed about the reviewers' comments. If there is disagreement between the two reviewers (rejection by one reviewer and acceptance or revisions required by the other), a third reviewer is invited. In any case, the editor is responsible for the final decision.
8. For round 2 of the review (revised material), the same principles as in round 1 are applied.
9. If the period of 2-4 weeks for submitting the revised material has elapsed, the authors are notified by email in order to conclude the resubmission procedure as soon as possible. If again they do not submit the revised material promptly, the manuscript is rejected and the review process has to start from the beginning.
10. If both reviewers accept the manuscript, the authors are instantly notified about the acceptance. The reviewers are also notified about the completion of the review.