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.111206
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(3); e111206

Peer Review Report for "Giant Seborrheic Keratosis on the Right Flank Part: A Case Report"

Author(s): Nazaninzahra Sepehri, Sepideh Babaniamansour, Sepideh Karkon-Shayan, Mohammadreza Majidi, Ahmadreza Atarodi, Hamideh Mohammadzadeh, Maryam Talaiee

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 14 Nov 2020
Revised Date: 16 Mar 2021
Accepted Date: 29 Mar 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) 8 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
I read the paper titled “Giant Seborrheic Keratosis on the Right Flank Part: A case report” with great interest. I would like to congratulate the authors for conducting this study. I would also like to thank the associate editor for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript.
The research presented a rare case of Seborrheic keratosis, its rare location, and presentation. Although the topic has been widely discussed, this is an interesting study, there are some errors that should be corrected by the authors to make it suitable for acceptance.
- There are some English errors. In the Case presentations, there is too much information that is better to be omitted to make it more scientific. the authors said, “The lesion started as a small papule ….. No color change was reported by the patient” besides that they attached figure 1 that shows a dark brown lesion but the papules are usually red or purple. I think the sentences should be changed to clarify the concept.
- According to the rare location of this lesion at the right flank, the history of allergen contact, occupation, skin burn should also be mentioned in the case presentation.
- At the end of the discussion, the authors mentioned that the patient had a good outcome. It is highly suggested to explain when they followed the patients and how that they achieve

good outcomes. In addition, discuss the outcome in other SK cases in the discussion part.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 12 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision.
Thanks

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 12 Mar 2021

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewer 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.

Dear chief editor of the Journal of Skin and Stem Cell
I read the paper titled “Giant Seborrheic Keratosis on the Right Flank Part: A case report” with great interest. I would like to congratulate the authors for conducting this study. I would also like to thank the editor for giving me the opportunity to review this manuscript.
The research presented a rare case of Seborrheic keratosis, its rare location, and presentation. Although the topic has been widely discussed, this is an interesting study, there are some errors that should be corrected to make it suitable for acceptance.

There are some English errors.

Response: the whole manuscript is edited by a native speaker, as you suggested.

In the Case presentations, there is too much information that is better to be omitted to make it more scientific.

Response: Thank you so much. We omitted several unimportant parts in case presentation in order to summarize and enhance the concept.

the authors said, “The lesion started as a small papule ….. No color change was reported by the patient” besides that they attached figure 1 that shows a dark brown lesion but the papules are usually red or purple. I think the sentences should be changed to clarify the concept.

Response: Thank you for esteemed comment. There is a typing error in this sentences because as the patient reported, the lesion was purple at first but changed into black tan at the end.

According to the rare location of this lesion at the right flank, the history of allergen contact, occupation, skin burn should also be mentioned in the case presentation.

Response: thank you for this comment. The patient had no history of allergy or skin burn and he was a retired farmer.

At the end of the discussion, the authors mentioned that the patient had a good outcome. It is highly suggested to explain when they followed the patients and how that they achieve good outcomes.

Response: thank you for wise point. We added more information to clarify the concept. The patient underwent regular physical examination every month for 6 months and there was no evidence of recurrence of the lesion in the physical examinations.

In addition, discuss the outcome in other SK cases in the discussion part.

Response: Thank you for esteemed comment. In summary, we discussed the outcome of SK case at the end of the discussion part.

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) 28 Mar 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for sending me the manuscript files for review. All the errors are corrected in the new version of the manuscript carefully. I would like to accept this version for publication.
Thanks

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 29 Mar 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 29 Mar 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.