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.110049
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 8(1); e110049

Peer Review Report for "General Health Status of Patients with Pemphigus Vulgaris"

Author(s): Narges Alizadeh, Abbas Darjani, Atefe Ghanbari, Afsane Hadipour

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 5 Oct 2020
Revised Date: 18 Jul 2021
Accepted Date: 26 Jul 2021

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Vasudha Abhijit Belgaumkar: Reviewer | Revision (0) 28 Apr 2021

Dear AE,
The topic is interesting but the manuscript needs extensive language editing and major revision before it can be considered for publication.
Abstract
- Line 3: Involves
- Line 4: rephrase " highly related.."
- 6 : what is meant by "public health"....there is no previous or further mention of this term...please note that this is not synonymous with "general health" which is the outcome measure of this study
- 8 : please make it .." that was.."
- 19 : rephrase conclusion
- 46 : defined
- 47: meaning unclear
- 56 : were referred
- 60/61: grammatical correction needed
- 93 : please change it to " no significant association was found between.."
- 103: This finding is consistent.
- 109 : rephrase the sentence
- 114 : Rephrase sentence. Mention that results cannot be generalized as the sample size

was small

- 121 : Please change it to " it was consistent with other studies…"
- 122 : newly diagnosed
- 123 -124: grammatically incorrect, meaning unclear
- 125: please make it " on the other hand…"." with the disease under long-term treatment…"
- 128 : what do you mean by interfering…do you mean " improve"
- 130 : pointed out
- 134 : remove "but"
- Mention definition of GHQ-28 positivity in the methods section
- 228: expand " years"…" months"
- Elaborate on a few relevant studies instead of simply citing them in brackets.

Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2021

Dear EIC

The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some major revisions to the manuscript. Therefore, I invite the author to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise his manuscript.

Kind regards,

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 19 May 2021

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs major revision. Please follow their comments as requested.

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.

Dear Sir/ madam

Thank you for your valuable comments. We revised the manuscript. I hope it is acceptable.

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: EIC | **Revision (1)** 26 Jul 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.