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.109466
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(4); e109466

Peer Review Report for "Efficacy of Adipose-Derived Stem Cells as a Potential Cellular Therapy of Alzheimer's Disease: A Comprehensive Systematic Review"

Author(s): Grady Krisandi, Rejoel Mangasa Siagian, Karina Karina, Imam Rosadi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 20 Sep 2020
Revised Date: 9 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 19 May 2021

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) — 14 Feb 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable research, here are a few tips for the authors;
1- There are a number of grammatical errors.
2- lines 73, 178 and 191, are ADSCs multipotent or pluripotent?
3- line 196, what does it mean "this problem is maintained by the ability of ADSCs to reduce ROS which increases self-renewal capacity of NSC and neurogenesis …"
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 27 Feb 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 3 Mar 2021

Dear Authors,

Minor revision is needed.

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.

Journal of Skin and Stem Cell

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to improve and resubmit our manuscript, ID JSSC-109466, entitled “Efficacy of Adipose-Derived Stem Cells as a Potential Cellular Therapy of Alzheimer: A Comprehensive Systematic Review” to the Journal of Skin and Stem Cell. The manuscript has been revised according to the comment of the reviewer.

We would like to thank the reviewer for their constructive and competent criticism. We hope you will find our responses and revisions to this manuscript acceptable for further consideration and possible publication in the Journal of Skin and Stem Cell.

Sincerely yours,

Imam Rosadi

Scientific Director, HayandraLab

Biology Department, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Mulawarman University

Jakarta, Indonesia

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1:
Thanks for your valuable research, here are a few tips;
Q: 1- There are a number of grammatical errors.

R: Thank you, the corrections in manuscript were fixed.

Q: 2- lines 73, 178 and 191, are ADSCs multipotent or pluripotent?

R: Thank you for your correction, ADSCs mostly has been reported as multipotent stem cells while some study stated it as pluripotent due to their capability to differentiate into many types of cells. However, in this manuscript, we change pluripotent to multipotent.

Q: 3- line 196, what does it mean "this problem is maintained by the ability of ADSCs to reduce ROS which increases self-renewal capacity of NSC and neurogenesis …"

R: This line means that ROS can induce neural stem cell and ADSCs to differentiate into neuron, however, ROS also toxic for newly differentiated neuron resulting cell death. Interestingly, ADSCs can inhibit and reduce ROS and increase self-renewal capacity of NSC through other pathway (NADPH oxidase and PI3K/Akt pathway). We already changed the statement as below:

Interestingly, ADSCs have ability to reduce ROS and increase self-renewal capacity of NSC that leads neurogenesis through NADPH oxidase and PI3K/Akt pathway.[25,32]

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) 4 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the appropriate answers. The amendments were acceptable.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 19 May 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 19 May 2021

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.