Journal of Skin and Stem Cell
Volume 7 · Issue 3 · e104632

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Surgical Pearl: Dissecting Forceps with Polytube for Periorbital Senile Comedone Extraction

Muhammed Mukhtar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
6 May 2020	8 Jun 2020	8 Jun 2020	10.5812/jssc.104632

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor, Editor-in-Chief 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 5
3 **Revision 2** Editor-in-Chief 6
Authors' reply to reviewers 7
Reviewer and editor comments 9

1 Original submission

3 comments · 29 May 2020 – 30 May 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 29 May 2020

Dear AE,
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. Please correct and use proper English writing
2. Please correct citation (Vancouver format citation)
3. Change the first fig. (Please substitute exquisite forceps. If I were you, I would have used better forceps)
4. Please use references of newer published article, if possible.
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 30 May 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision. The authors should revise the manuscript based on reviewer comments.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MAJOR REVISION 30 May 2020

Dear Author,
The manuscript should be accept after revision.
Thanks.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Revised letter

To

The reviewer

SSRC

Dear Madam/Sir

I am pleased to resubmit the revised manuscript, as per comments and suggestions given by you on the article entitled " Surgical pearl: Dissecting forceps with polytube for periorbital senile comedone extraction " in the section of " letter to the editor " for publication in your esteemed journal. The article mentions a novel, less invasive technique for treating senile comedone over eyelid and periorbital region where presently available instruments are traumatic in nature .

This manuscript is entirely an original work of mine and has not been submitted anywhere as an author, take responsibility for the contents of the manuscript. All figures in this article are original. Author is aware of the journal's conflict of interest policy, and I am aware that this manuscript is being submitted to the journal. Author declares that I have no specific conflict of interest to declare.

Yours sincerely

31st May, 2020

tions given by the reviwer and the editor.

Reviewers' Comments:

Reply to the suggestion given by Reviewer 1:For

1. please correct and use proper English writing- I had to rewrite major part of the article as it was required significant change in the sentence

2. please correct citation (Vancouver format citation)-corrected

3.change the first fig. (Please substitute exquisite forceps. If I were you, I would hav e used better forceps)- I removed fig1A and kept figB as fig.1

4. please use references of newer published article, if possible.-I have have changed 3 out of 5 refrences

. 5.The changes in the manuscript are heighlighted of 2.3 and 4 comments

---

2 Revision 1

3 comments · 4 Jun 2020 – 5 Jun 2020

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 4 Jun 2020

Dear AE:
There are some comments which should be addressed by the author:
1. References have not Vancouver format (for example; your first reference should be written as Izumi AK, Marples RR, Kligman AM, Path MR. Senile (solar) comedones. Journal of Investigative Dermatology. 1973 Jul 1;61(1):46-50.
2. Your manuscript still needs some English writing corrections and should be replaced by better academic words. For instance ; line 9 (in about) and line 26 (with).
Thanks.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 5 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript still needs revision.
Thanks.

Editor-in-Chief

MINOR REVISION 5 Jun 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.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Revised letter

To

The reviewer

SSRC

Dear Madam/Sir

I am pleased to resubmit the revised manuscript, as per comments and suggestions given by you on the article entitled " Surgical pearl: Dissecting forceps with polytube for periorbital senile comedone extraction " in the section of " letter to the editor " for publication in your esteemed journal. The article mentions a novel, less invasive technique for treating senile comedone over eyelid and periorbital region where presently available instruments are traumatic in nature .

This manuscript is entirely an original work of mine and has not been submitted anywhere as an author, take responsibility for the contents of the manuscript. All figures in this article are original. Author is aware of the journal's conflict of interest policy, and I am aware that this manuscript is being submitted to the journal. Author declares that I have no specific conflict of interest to declare.

Yours sincerely

06 June , 2020

Corrections are done in the manuscript as per comments and suggestions given by the reviwer and the editor.

Reviewers' Comments: Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1: Dear author(s):1. References have not Vancouver format (for example; your first reference should be written as : Izumi AK, Marples RR, Kligman AM, Path MR. Senile (solar) comedones. Journal of Investigative Dermatology. 1973 Jul 1;61(1):46-50… It is tried to correct as per Vancouver format in all 5 references2. Your manuscript still need some English writing corrections and should be replaced by better academic words. For instance ; line 9 (in about) and line 26 (with).. Corrections done and these lines are highlighted in the manuscript

---

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript still needs revision. Sir, I tried to do its revision as per the reviewer's comments and suggestions

---

EIC Decision:

Minor revision.. tried to revise

---

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 8 Jun 2020

Editor-in-Chief

ACCEPT 8 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.