OPEN PEER REVIEW

Open Peer Review (OPR)

As a new feature for progressing towards transparency, we decided to open a new window for all of our editors as well as authors titled "**Open Peer Review**". We hope by this new facility, our reviewers will be more motivated and authors will be more satisfied with the review process. We believe that publishing our peer review reports could make a transparent and clear environment for all our efforts within a journal, but not all reviewers tend to publish their comments.

What is "Open Peer Review" process?

An "Open Peer Review" process is making the details of all review process (including reviewers, associate editors, and EICs comments) as "Public" as it is agreed by EIC, Authors, and reviewers.

Advantages of "Open Peer Review" process

- More transparency, constructiveness and tactful comments of the peer review process: leads to an increase in the quality of reviews
- More motivations for all involved roles in the review process
- Authors' satisfactions from the review process: Increases honesty between authors and reviewers
- Education of both authors and new students
- Prevents reviewers from following their individual agendas and leading to the detection of reviewers' conflicts of interests

You can find out more at:
https://sites.kowsarpub.com/kowsar/knowledgebase/category/tree.html#opr.html

Journal of Skin and Stem Cell
Article DOI: 10.5812/jssc.101509
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 6(2); e101509

Peer Review Report for "Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: A Comparison Between Turkey and Iran"

Author(s): Tansu Sayar Kanyış

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 30 Jan 2020
Revised Date: 15 Feb 2020
Accepted Date: 16 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 7 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
This is a good article and interesting.
1- Please enter the introduction section in more detail because Slightly similar to the abstract or summary.
2- The result section should be a bit concise and briefer.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) 9 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
The authors investigated the rules related to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Researches between Turkey and Iran. The study is well conducted and the writing used is appropriate and the data is presented clearly. A few issues, however, need to be addressed:
Minor revised
1: if you decided to compare Islamic rules in human embryonic stem cell researches, it was better to enter some other Islamic countries' rules too. Why did the authors compare just turkey and Iran Rules related to human embryonic researches?
2: we would like to suggest the authors that make a part to describe human embryonic

development stages or illustrate it with a diagram.
3: we would like to suggest the manuscript authors apply a table to compare turkey and Iran rules related to this study briefly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 10 Feb 2020

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.
Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 10 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor revision. Please follow their comments as requested.
Thanks.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Reply to Reviewers

Ideally, the reviewing process can significantly improve the submitted manuscripts by allowing the authors to take into account the advice of reviewers. Author(s) must reply to all reviewers' comments in a separate Word file, point by point. A "**Reply to Reviewers**" document is submitted along with revised manuscript during submission of revised files, summarizing the changes that the authors made in response to the reviewers' comments. The responses to reviewers' comments specifies how the authors addressed each comment the reviewers made.

You can read the authors' responses to the reviewers' comments in the next page.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The authors investigated the rules related to Human Embryonic Stem Cell Researches between Turkey and Iran. The study is well conducted and the writing used is appropriate and the data is presented clearly. A few issues, however, need to be addressed:

Minor revised

1: if you decided to compare Islamic rules in human embryonic stem cell researches, it was better to enter some other Islamic countries rules too. Why the authors compare just turkey and Iran Rules related to human embryonic researches?

The target of my study is to compare legal rules of two states. Because Iran is an Islamic Republic, and Turkey is a Secular Republic their ways of legislation have differences.

State attitudes on legislating new medical technologies such as human embryonic stem cell researches have a large variety. Although they may have some effects, I think, these attitudes are independent from religion and geography. As it is seen in the table I put below for the answer of the third question, Although U.K. and Iran have different religions, they have much in common on legislating the matter of human embryonic stem cell researches. However U.K. and Germany have different legislations.

In my study, I wanted to compare two states that have opposite attitudes on legislating the matter. I chose Turkey and Iran because although there are many studies on the other states, Turkey and Iran are rarely examined. It is possible to find some studies that examined the subject of human embryonic stem cell researches in medical, ethical and religious point of views. However especially in the legal point of view, it is hard to find studies on Iran and Turkey.

2: we would like to suggest the authors that make a part to describe human embryonic development stages or illustrate it with a diagram.

It would be so rational to make a part on the description of human embryonic development stages in such a study. Author information are not given to the reviewers, so I need to say that, unfortunately I have no expertise on medicine. My expertise is on law. So, although I read much on the embryonic development, I have no authority to describe it by myself. I can find the descriptions from medical monographies and quote them but why would anyone read such a subject from an expert of law? I think writing on embryonic development in my study would not be beneficial because of my lack of expertise on the matter.

3: we would like to suggest the manuscript authors to apply a table to compare turkey and Iran rules related to this study briefly.

For the answer of this comment, the text and table below is added to the manuscript:

“States obligations to provide a proper protection to human embryos, causes different attitudes and a large variety on their hescrs legislations. In the table below, it is possible to see variety in the legislations of different states.[1]

	Permits the use of surplus embryos in hescrs	Permits the use of produced embryos in hescrs
Turkey	-	-
Iran	+	+
Saudi Arabia	+	+
Tunusia	-	-
Italy	-	-
Ireland	-	-
U.K.	+	+
Germany	+	-
France	+	-
U.S.A.	+	+
S. Korea	+	+

“

Reviewer 2:

This is a good article and interesting.

1- Please enter the introduction section in more detail becouse Slightly similar to the abstract or summary.

In order to maintain the requirements of this comment, a new paragraph and the table under the third answer is added to the introduction section.

2- The result section should be a bit concise and more brief.

1 While looking at the permitting states, it should be considered that permission is given after providing the conditions that each state legislates for the matter. For further information on each states conditions to give permission, please check;
For Tunusia and Saudi Arabia: The Hinxton Group. World Stem Cell Policies. Available at: http://www.hinxtongroup.org/wp_mea_exc.html, (Date of Access: 13.02.2020).
For Italy, Ireland, U.K., Germany, France, U.S.A. and South Korea: Tansu Sayar. Legal Status of the Unborn and Its Protection Through Criminal Law. Unpublished Master Thesis, 2018, available at: https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp, (Date of Access: 13.02.2020).
Information for Turkey and Iran derived from this study.

In order to maintain the requirements of this comment, title of the conclusion section is changed as “discussion” and a new concise and brief conclusion part is added with “conclusion” title.

Thank you for your valuble and developmental views. I hope my answers maintain the requirements.

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Revision (1)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (1)** 16 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.