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.114158
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 8(1); e114158

Peer Review Report for "Cutaneous Metastasis of Signet Ring Cell Carcinoma: An Unusual Case Report"

Author(s): Shekhar N Pradhan, Asha S Khade, Umesh Y Bhoi, Sudarshan Gaurkar, Liza Borah, Malika Sharma

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 28 Feb 2021
Revised Date: 28 Aug 2021
Accepted Date: 28 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.

Hojat Eftekhari: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 20 May 2021

Dear AE,
I read the manuscript. I like it. The authors should check the lab test and type them in a public manner. They should check the unit of platelets in the manuscript. They might search and add more articles for improving the manuscript.
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,
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.

Reply to reviewers

Reviewer 1: Thankyou Sir/Madam for appreciating my manuscript.

I have checked all the lab tests and typed them in public manner and I have highlighted these in red.

Regarding the platelet count I have checked the units and changed it.

I have also added 4-5 more articles among the references each of which has been highlighted in red.

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)** 28 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.