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.111118
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(4); e111118

Peer Review Report for "Evaluating the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teledermatology"

Author(s): Amit S. Kerure, Nitika S. Deshmukh, Shaurya Rohatgi, Sandeep Agarwal

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 15 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 26 May 2021
Accepted Date: 3 Jun 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) — 20 May 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for choosing this interesting topic, but I have questions from the authors:
1- The title of your article is “pros and cons of tele-dermatology” while you focus more on the disadvantages.
2- As you explained in Table 2, obtaining patient information may not be difficult, but you emphasize that obtaining information in this method is difficult and is one of the weaknesses of this method. Based on your description in Table 2, there may be ways to get better information, isn't that so?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 21 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) — 21 May 2021

Dear Authors,

A 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.

Reply to reviewers:

Thanks for reviewing our manuscript and considering it for publication.

The replies to the reviewers comments are as below:

Reviewer 1:
Thank you for choosing this interesting topic, but I have questions:
1- The title of your article is “pros and cons of tele-dermatology” while you focus more on the disadvantages.

We have added a separate paragraph (red font) in page 3, line 58 to 69 stating the advantages/ pros of teledermatology.

We have also made some minor changes in table 1 (red font) making the data more descriptive

2- As you explained in Table 2, obtaining patient information may not be difficult, but you emphasize that obtaining information in this method is difficult and is one of the weaknesses of this method. Based on your description in Table 2, there may be ways to get better information, isn't that so

We have changed the title of table 2 as Features of S & F type and LI type of Teledermatology rather than advantages and disadvantages of above two methods. For obtaining patient data, we have included details in column 1 , row 2 of table 2 as highlighted in yellow.

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) — 31 May 2021

Dear AE,
The authors' explanations were convincing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 3 Jun 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) — 3 Jun 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.