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.105911
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(1); e105911

Peer Review Report for "Analysis of the Most Commonly Encountered Diagnoses in Academic Dermatopathology"

Author(s): Vladimir Vincek, Eric Rudnick, Kiran Motaparthi, Addie Walker

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 1 Jun 2020
Revised Date: 16 Jun 2020
Accepted Date: 16 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.

Parvaneh Hatami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 13 Jun 2020

Dear AE,
I have read the manuscript. This paper is clearly written and well organized. I think that all parts of this paper are reasonable and I could not find any considerable mistake in them.
- However, in conclusion, part, there was a mistake on line 8 (14% should be changed to 4%).
As a reviewer, I think that this paper is suitable for publication in this journal.
sincerely yours

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 14 Jun 2020

Dear EIC,
The authors should add a reference number at the end of each sentence that they referred to a study.
for example in the below sentence:
- In dermatopathology fellowship programs associated with cancer centers, the percentage of examined specimens representing inflammatory or infectious disorders may be even lower.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**0**) 14 Jun 2020

Dear Author,

Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers' and Associated editor 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.

Reviewer comments and changes made:

1. *“In conclusion part, there was a mistake on line 8 (14% should be changed to 4%).”*
   This change was made and tracked in the word document

2. *“Please add reference number at the end of each sentence that you referred to a study.*
   for example in the below sentence: In dermatopathology fellowship programs associated with cancer centers, the percentage of examined specimens representing inflammatory or infectious disorders may be even lower.
   This sentence has been deleted in the manuscript as it was an opinion of possible representative specimens at a cancer center (owing to an increase number of referrals for tumor diagnosis). No reference is available. The deleted sentence is tracked in the word document.

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: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 16 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) 16 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.