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.112575
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 8(1); e112575

Peer Review Report for "Cephalosporin-Induced Atypical DRESS Syndrome; a Tale of Two Cases"

Author(s): Ravindranath Brahmadeo Chavan, Vasudha Abhijit Belgaumkar, Nitika S. Deshmukh, Amruta Patil, Vijay Deepak Joshi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 4 Jan 2021
Revised Date: 11 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 11 Aug 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) — 7 Aug 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- please check the definition of the case series. I think it is better to say two cases.
- please use both diagnostic criteria tables in your manuscript.
- please use newer articles in references.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) — 7 Aug 2021

Dear EIC
The reviewer(s) have recommended publication, but also suggest some minor 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) — 7 Aug 2021

Dear Author,

Your article is reviewed by the reviewers carefully. According to their comments, this document needs minor 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.

Response to the Reviewers

Dear reviewers,

Journal of Skin and Stem Cell

Hereby we would like to respond to the reviewers' comments regarding our manuscript – Cephalosporin – induced Atypical DRESS syndrome- a case series.

Manuscript ID- 112575.

Reviewer 1-

Comment -1:

Hello dear,

Please check the definition of case series. I think it is better to say two cases.

Response-1:

Thank you for the suggestion. We have rephrased our title as - **Cephalosporin-induced Atypical DRESS syndrome – a tale of two cases. Here we have removed the words "case series" from the title as well as from other places.**

Comment-2: Please use both diagnostic criteria table in your manuscript.

Response- 2: We had earlier excluded the tables from our manuscript due to similarity report and plagiarism issues. However, we have included them (RegiSCAR and J-SCAR criteria) according to your suggestion in the revised manuscript.

Comment-3 :

Please use newer articles in the references.

Response-3: We have removed the older references and included the newer articles in their place and the concerned changes have been highlighted.

Thank you for your suggestions.

Looking forward to your positive response.

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)** 11 Aug 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.