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.102561
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 6(4); e102561

Peer Review Report for "Cyclodextrins in Skin Formulations and Transdermal Delivery"

Author(s): Laszlo Jicsinszky, Giancarlo Cravotto

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 11 Mar 2020
Revised Date: 5 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 6 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: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 29 Mar 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript is well written and is a valuable manuscript.
But it needs some minor revision:
Figures
1-The Figure(s) is(are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention all Figures in the text consecutively (Figure 4).
2-Word Counts
We have detected the maximum allowed word count in your manuscript was not in line with the journal standards. For example, maximum allowable of word counts in a review article must be 5000 words while in your manuscript is 8200. Although the maximum word count of the review article in this journal is 500 words. but if it hurts to your manuscript i request you to summarize it to 7000 words at least.
3- The number of references is too much. Please SUMMARIZE IT TO 70 REFERENCES.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 29 Mar 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is suitable for publication after minor revision.

Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0)

29 Mar 2020

Dear Author,

Please revise the manuscript based on reviewer 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.

Dear Editor,

The reviewer’s efforts are greatly appreciated and the authors are thankful to the reviewers for the helpful recommendations. The manuscript was revised in line with the reviewer’s comments and remarks. The authors' feedback to the comments is written in *blue and italics*.

Answer for comments of **Referee 1**

First of all, the authors would like to express their thanks to the referee for her/his efforts to improve the quality of our manuscript. Our response to **Referee 1** concerns are the followings:

1-The Figure(s) is(are) not mentioned in the text correctly. Please, mention all Figure in the text consecutively (Figure 4).

The missing mention of Figure 4 is corrected.

2-Word Counts

We have detected the maximum allowed word count in your manuscript was not in line with the journal standards. For example, maximum allowable of word counts in a review article must be 5000 words while in your manuscript is 8200. Although the maximum word count of review article in this journal is 500 words. but if it hurts to your manuscript i request you to summarize it to 7000 words at least.

The text in the manuscript has been shortened and some rephrasing the number of words is reduced to 7002 by MS Word2013 counting.

3- The number of references is too much. Please SUMMARIZE IT TO 70 REFERENCES.

The number of references reduced to 70.

Sincerely yours,

the authors

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)** 6 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.