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.107198
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(3); e107198

Peer Review Report for "Nicolau Syndrome Following Intralesional Sclerotherapy: A Dreaded Complication of a Simple Office Procedure"

Author(s): Nitika S Deshmukh, Vasudha Abhijit Belgaumkar, Ravindranath Brahmadeo Chavan, Neelam Bhatt

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 6 Jul 2020
Revised Date: 31 Aug 2020
Accepted Date: 5 Sep 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) — 15 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
It is an interesting and well-written case report.
Thanks.

Parvaneh Hatami: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 16 Aug 2020

Dear AE,
I am very glad to review this essay. This manuscript does an excellent job explaining a rare complication following a common procedure. However,it seems that some minor revisions are required:
1. The manuscript has some phrasing and grammatical issues. For example, there isn't any space between words in several parts of the article or the sentence in line 7 doesn't seem good.
2. The order of paragraphs in discussion part better to be changed and explanation of sclerotherapy as a treatment option for PG needs to be placed before the paragraph about your case.
3. It would be better to add some information about treating PG with sclerotherapy to

introduction part since this is not a common treatment option for PG.
4. In the case presentation section,it is better to mention the name of antibiotics prescribed for the patient .
5. Please explain why you didn't use steroid for reducing inflammation?
6. As you definitely know,when our reference is a case report,we can only reference to author's specific experience with that particular drug (not other drugs mentioned in introduction part) . Considering this, in line 54-56 , the references of only 4 drugs out of 12 mentioned in reference part ,so this part of paper needs to be completed.
I will be glad to read your essay after revision.
Best regards,

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 22 Aug 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 22 Aug 2020

Dear Author,
The manuscript needs minor revision. Please revise the manuscript based on 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 1:
It is an interesting and well written case report.

Response : Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and offering us your positive and encouraging feedback.

Reviewer 2:
Dear Authors,
I am very glad to review this essay. This manuscript does an excellent job explaining a rare complication following a common procedure. However, it seems that some minor revisions are required:

Response: Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and sharing your constructive suggestions for improvement. Please find below a point-by point response to your comments.
1. The manuscript has some phrasing and grammatical issues .For example, there isn't any space between words in several parts of the article or the sentence in line 7 doesn't seem good.
Response : The phrasing, spacing and grammatical errors have been double-checked and rectified. Sentence in line 7 has been re-phrased

2.The order of paragraphs in discussion part better to be changed and explanation of sclerotherapy as a treatment option for PG needs to be placed before the paragraph about your case.

Response : The order of paragraphs in discussion section has been changed as suggested.

3.It would be better to add some information about treating PG with sclerotherapy to introduction part since this is not a common treatment option for PG.

Response : Information about treating PG with sclerotherapy has been added to introduction section.
4.In the case presentation section,it is better to mention the name of antibiotics prescribed for the patient .

Response : Name of antibiotic prescribed has been mentioned in revised manuscript

5.Please explain why you didn't use steroid for reducing inflammation?

Response : The Color Doppler study demonstrated vasospasm of the arteries with reduced blood velocity. Clinically there were obvious signs of ischemia rather than inflammation (local temperature of involved area was lower than surrounding skin) Steroids were not

administered as we believed they would have offered limited benefit at this stage. Another reason for avoiding steroids was to minimise aggravation of secondary infection which had already set in due to ischemia and impending gangrene. We used vasodilatory and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs after considering the risk-benefit ratio. This explanation has now been included in the revised manuscript.

6.As you definitely know,when our reference is a case report,we can only reference to author's specific experience with that particular drug (not other drugs mentioned in introduction part) .Considering this, in line 54-56 , the references of only 4 drugs out of 12 mentioned in reference part ,so this part of paper needs to be completed.

Response: References for all the mentioned drugs have now been cited. Please note that there is considerable overlap as some of these references have either made a mention of more than one drug or have cross-references in which these drugs are included.

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.

Parvaneh Hatami: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 2 Sep 2020

Dear AE,
Thanks to the authors for revising the manuscript and considering my comments.
I think their well-written case report is suitable for publishing now.
Thanks.

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

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 5 Sep 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.