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.104559
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(1); e104559

Peer Review Report for "History of Dermal and Subdermal Injectable Fillers Before Collagen: The Early Years"

Author(s): Omeed Memar

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 May 2020
Revised Date: 28 May 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Jun 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 May 2020

Dear AE,
In this manuscript, old fillers have been completely described so it is a valuable text. It has a full history of old fillers but this article is too long and it could be summarized and references should be written in parenthesis.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 8 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should revise the manuscript based on reviewer comments and file which attached.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 8 May 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.

Academic Dermatology and Skin Cancer Institute

5/26/2020

Dr. Parvin Mansouri
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Skin and Stem Cell

Dear Dr. Parvin Mansouri

I am submitting a reply to reviewers:

History of dermal and subdermal injectable fillers before collagen: the early years
Omeed Memar*
Academic Dermatology & Skin Cancer Institute, Chicago, Illinois
*Corresponding author: Omeed Memar, Academic Dermatology and Skin Cancer Institute, 130 N. Garland Ct, Chicago, IL 60602. Telephone 312 230 0180; E-mail: omeedmemar@gmail.com

Thank you for your review and very constructive guidance on improving this manuscript. I have reduced the total word count of the article and made it as concise as possible without removing pertinent material. Thank you again.

Sincerely,



Omeed Memar, MD, PhD

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) 3 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The manuscript was properly summarized by author.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 5 Jun 2020

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 5 Jun 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.