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.102387
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 6(3); e102387

Peer Review Report for "Becker's Nevus in a 24-Year-Old Female Patient with Rheumatoid Arthritis: A Case Report of a Laser Therapy Without Recurrence"

Author(s): Hossein Hafezi, Ali Asilian, Maryam Bemanalizadeh, Vahid Mansouri, Akramsadat Amiri, Hamid Galehdari

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 3 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 3 Mar 2020
Accepted Date: 9 Apr 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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 3 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 3 Apr 2020

Dear Authors,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers' comments.
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.

Comment	Answer
Correct the text of the article literally.	The whole of the text underwent double proof-reading. Once with proof-reading software Grammarly and second by one of the colleagues with experience in writing scientific manuscripts.
Please check these words in MeSH.	All the keywords were checked with the MeSH directory and substituted with a suitable one.
“at the time of the writing of this article” Or “in 2014”?	We mean to the time of writing this report, the Rasi’s study was the largest. Thank You for your precise comment.
Which center? Is it a skin disease related clinic?	They recruited their patients from the outpatient dermatology department in Hazrat-e Rasool Hospital, Tehran, Iran, from July 2003 to July 2010.
Please correct the sentence: “, simultaneous occurrence with RA and immunosuppressive therapy (in relevance with our case) and also…….”	Corrected. Thank You.
“Reports” Or “report”?	“Report” was correct. Corrected. Thank You
Do you mean the patient has no other problem? Please write more clearly.	Thank you for your comment. We meant that additional evaluations were made in search of other possible diagnoses.
next step??? You can start the sentence by saying "We used .... to treat ……"	Thank You. Corrected.
The phrase of “the patient’s Becker’s nevus” should be changed to “The nevus” or “The lesion”.	Thank You for your comment. Corrected.
So, unlike what you wrote in the title of the article, there was no complete and successful recovery. You can write in the title: A case report of laser therapy without recurrence.	Thank you for your comment. As you mentioned, focusing on recurrence is much better than focusing on the complete effectiveness of the treatment. It is corrected as you said.
In the "discussion" you should also mention the articles that used the laser to treat the lesion, but after some time the lesion recurred. (since the title of your article focuses more on treatment)	I added some sentences for supporting that in the discussion. Past studies suggested intermittent maintenance therapy, due to a high chance of recurrence, especially in the sun-exposed areas (9). Also, transient hyperpigmentation after the use of laser was reported in another study (10).
Correct this phrase literally.	Thank You for your comment. Corrected.
This sentence is not clear. Do you mean that since RA developed after nevus and, on the other hand, we do not have a syndrome with these characteristics (due to lack of similar cases), it is unlikely that the patient has a syndrome related to Becker's nevus?	Thanks for the question. That is exactly what we mean. We think that RA is not a part of becker nevus syndrome. Therefore the effects we examined on the becker nevus were due to the medication she was taking for RA, which affects her immune response, not the common pathogenesis with RA. I changed the sentences to: Previous studies did not report any association between RA and this lesion. Besides, although RA and the lesion co-existed in this patient, the development of RA was apparently after the development of the lesion; therefore, it is unlikely for this presentation to be interpreted as Becker's nevus syndrome.
Do you mean “based on the effect of these drugs on pigmentation”?	Thank you for your question. Yes, we mean that we could not associate the examined altered pigmentation to drug effects, solely.

	There should be some other underlying factors to justify the changes.
Considering the role of the immune system in worsening the lesion, you should write after the reference # 9: **,so, the immune deficiency caused by the above immunosuppressive drugs can contribute to the healing of the lesion and the good response to laser treatment (without any recurrence).**	Thank you for the correction and aid in making the text more clear. I added the sentence you mentioned.
Please change this sentence to: According to what was mentioned above and also, what we observed in our patient, it can be concluded that immune system involvement may be effective in the occurrence of such a lesion.	Thank You for your correction. I changed the sentence.
Please change “possible” to “effective”.	Thank You. I changed it.
Please omit the word of “further”.	Thank you. I omitted that.
Larger than what? (which study?) You should write: with **large** sample sizes	Yes, I corrected that.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 9 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is accepted for publication.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 9 Apr 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.