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.112088
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(4); e112088

Peer Review Report for "Systemic Medical and Procedural Therapies for Mucosal Lichen Planus: Update and Review of Challenges and Successes"

Author(s): Thais Pincelli, Leila Tolaymat, Jason Sluzevich, Alison Bruce

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 10 Apr 2021
Revised Date: 29 Jun 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.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 26 May 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for this valuable research, The authors should answer the following questions:
1- Line 10, what is the meaning of “functional compromise”?
2- Line 11, what is the meaning of “synechae”? synechae is not correct.
3- Inconsistency of some references in the text with end references. (15, 23, 24, 43)
4- Line 137, explain the varying responses to IVIG.
5- There are a number of writing errors.
6- Many of the references used are old. Has no research been done in recent years, including 2020 and 2021?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 31 May 2021

Dear EIC,
The manuscript needs minor revision, The authors should revise the manuscript based on comments.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (**0**) 31 May 2021

Dear Author,

Major 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.

Point by Point Response

We thank the reviewer and all at **Journal of Skin and Stem Cell** for the input, suggestions, and feedback. We accept their concerns and necessary changes have been made to the manuscript.

1- Line 10, what is the meaning of “functional compromise”? This has been changed to a more appropriate term “organ function compromise”.

2- Line 11, what is the meaning of “synechae”? synechae is not correct. This has been changed to the correct term “synechiae”.

3- Inconsistency of some references in the text with end references. (15, 23, 24, 43). These references have been checked and corrected appropriately.

4- Line 137, explain the varying responses to IVIG. This was nicely expanded upon in the main text.

5- There are a number of writing errors. The manuscript has been reviewed in its entirety and any writing errors have been corrected.

6- Many of the references used are old. Has no research been done in recent years, including 2020 and 2021? included additional more recent references from 2019,2020 and 2021 – the PubMed links for them are below I repeated a PubMed search for the most recent articles and based on that the following additional references were reviewed and included in the manuscript:

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33741218/, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32015380/, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31268212/, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33548058/

We thank the reviewer and all at Experimental Dermatology for the input, suggestions, and feedback. We accept their concerns and necessary changes have been made to the manuscript. We agree with the reviewer’s comment about the title and have changed it accordingly. We have slightly condensed the article, while still keeping its relevant content.

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) 1 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the answers and corrections.
What is the meaning of “&ndash” in manuscript title?
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Jul 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Jul 2021

Dear Author,
It is accepted for publication.
Thanks.