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.105455
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(2); e105455

Peer Review Report for "Cutaneous Elastorrhexis; A Heralding Sign of Gronblad-Strandberg Syndrome: A Case Report"

Author(s): Nitika S Deshmukh, Ravindranath Brahmadeo Chavan, Vasudha Abhijit Belgaumkar, Vijay Raut

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 26 May 2020
Revised Date: 13 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 20 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) — 3 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
The quality of clinical and histopathological images is not good.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs edit in English editing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 10 Jun 2020

Dear Author,
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.

Reply to reviewer's comments-

Thank you for your kind review of our manuscript ID 105455 and constructive suggestions. Please find below responses to your comments.

Reviewer 1:
Quality of clinical and histopathological images are not good.

Reply: Our apologies for the suboptimal quality of the images submitted earlier. We have now changed the images in the revised submission. Image quality might been compromised as we collaged the pictures together. Now, we are uploading each image separately.

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript needs edit in english writing.

Reply: The manuscript has been edited with rectification of all grammatical, punctuation and language errors. In accordance with the instructions given, the new and modified sentences have been highlighted in the revised manuscript.

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) 17 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
New figures are more acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 20 Jun 2020

Dear EIC
Based on the authors' answers to the reviewers' comments, the reviewer(s) have recommended publication.
Kind regards.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 20 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.