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.103472
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(1); e103472

Peer Review Report for "Application of Bee Products for Dermatological Problems"

Author(s): Heidrun Männle, Karsten Münstedt

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 7 Apr 2020
Revised Date: 29 Apr 2020
Accepted Date: 3 May 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) — 8 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1- It's best in context part to change this sentence to: 27 books which focussed on the topic suggested 15 completely different treatment options. =>27 books on the subject suggested 15 completely different treatment options.
2- Please add references in first paragraph of Intertrigo title.
Thanks.

Vajihe Taghdiri Nooshabadi: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 12 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
This manuscript can be accepted after minor changes highlighted in the PDF version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | Revision (0) — 12 Apr 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise the manuscript based on comments and pdf file in the attachment.

Thanks.

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

12 Apr 2020

Dear Author,

The manuscript needs minor revision.

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.

Answer to the reviewers

Reviewer 1:
1- its best in context part change this sentence to: 27 books which focussed on the topic suggested 15 completely different treatment options. =>27 books on the subject suggested 15 completely different treatment options.

Answer: Done as requested

2- please add references in first paragraph of Intertrigo title.

Answer: Done as requested

Reviewer 2:

This manuscript can be accepted after minor changes that highlighted in the PDF version.

Answer: Unfortunately we have not been able to get the mentioned pdf-form. We contacted the journal several times because we believe that it the reviewer added valuable details.

Additional comments

This study presents some interesting published data about bee products for dermatological disorders treatment. The paper is generally well written and structured. However, I would like to suggest you to do a classification of skin disorders before explaining the studies related to bee products effect treatment efficacy.

Answer: Basically, we are willing to listen to reviewer advices. In order to do this we came across the paper "Aractingi S. Classifying skin diseases: Until where should we go? Exp Dermatol. 2017 Aug;26(8):681-682. doi: 10.1111/exd.13230.". It shows that there is no accepted system for the classification of skin diseases and that molecular tools offer a great potential but also a large complexity. We want to mention again that the focus of our article is on the treatment of skin diseases with bee products. Although classifications are always useful, an attempt to classify skin diseases will distract the reader from our genuine topic.

It's better to merge some parts to another one. Its structure is not a professional academicals manuscript.

Answer: These suggestions are very unspecific and may relate to the wish for the classification of skin diseases. If the suggestions were more specific we would be glad to restructure the manuscript. We agree that there is no clear ordering system. The revised version is ordered alphabetically. This may help the reader to find interesting topics.

Also, the conclusion part should be rewrite because in this part, we need to see a good comparison of bee products efficacy in various skin diseases, I mean it's better to suggest that u understood the bee products can be more effective in which one/ ones dermatological problems after your valuable investigations.

Answer: We have added a sentence to make this point more clear.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 30 Apr 2020

Dear AE,
In their response to my previous comments, the authors have attempted to edit the manuscript.
thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 3 May 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 3 May 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.