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.115357
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 8(1); e115357

Peer Review Report for "Presternal Scrofuloderma: Tip of the Iceberg Unveiling Multifocal Extrapulmonary Tuberculosis - A Rare Case Report"

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

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 17 Apr 2021
Revised Date: 23 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.

Anup Kumar Tiwary: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 1 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
It is a Nicely written manuscript.
Few corrections and improvisation are much needed.
1. Figure 2 doesn't show 4th lumbar vertebrae. Add a clear image of sclerosis of that.
2. Kindly mention which sample was used for acid fast bacillary culture.
3. Add CT thorax and MRI spine images to authenticate the diagnosis.
4. References are not written as per the journal standard. Don't write month in reference. Follow the author's instructions carefully.
Thanks.

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

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision (0)** 12 Jun 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:

According to the suggestions by reviewers, we would like to make corrections in our manuscript entitled : Presternal Scrofuloderma: Tip of the iceberg unveiling multifocal extrapulmonary tuberculosis - A rare case report.

Manuscript ID: 115357

Reviewers' Comments:

Reviewer 1:
Comment- Nicely written manuscript
Reply: We highly appreciate your valuable admiration of our work. Looking forward to a positive response from your side regarding the publication of our manuscript.

Reviewer's suggestion: Few corrections and improvisation are much needed.

Correction 1: Figure 2 doesn't show 4th lumbar vertebrae. Add a clear image of sclerosis of that.
Reply: We would like to highlight the **manubrial sclerosis** in this figure (anteroposterior and lateral chest X ray) as depicted by red arrows. To support the finding of 4^{th} lumbar vertebral sclerosis we have included MRI spine (sagittal view) image of the same patient as figure-3.

Correction 2. Kindly mention which sample was used for acid fast bacillary culture.
Reply: The sample used for acid fast bacillary culture was seropurulent sinus discharge as highlighted in the revised manuscript.

Correction 3. Add CT thorax and MRI spine images to authenticate the diagnosis.
Reply- MRI spine (sagittal view) image has been included as figure- 3 in revised manuscript. CT scan reporting was done after **screening all the possible foci of tuberculosis,** however images/plates could not be retrieved due to cost constraints in our resource poor setting.

4. References are not written as per the journal standard. Don't write month in reference. Follow the author instructions carefully.
Reply: As per the journal guidelines mentioned on the website:

Structure:

- **Author's surname**, followed by the initials or **first name**; for articles by up to and including **six** authors, list all authors separated by **commas**
- The **title of the article**, followed by a full stop
- The **title of the journal** abbreviated. No punctuation should be used.
- **Date of publication**: the year followed by the month (abbreviated to three letters) and the day followed by a semi-colon.
- The **volume and issue** number, the latter in brackets, followed by a colon
- The **page numbers**, followed by a full stop

We have structured our manuscript and cited references in consistency with the above guidelines.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
The manuscript needs minor revision. Please revise the manuscript based on comments.

Reply: Thank you for the suggestion. We have incorporated all the suggestions by the reviewer and restructured our manuscript accordingly.

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: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) 1 Jul 2021

Dear AE,
Comments for the authors:
- Where is the 'day' after a month (abbreviated as 3 letters)?
For example, 25 is the day of the month of July in the article below.
Halpern SD, Ubel PA, Caplan AL. Solid-organ transplantation in HIV-infected patients. N Engl J Med. 2002 Jul 25;347(4):284-7.
- Follow the instructions very carefully.
Thanks.

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

Dear EIC,
The manuscript is acceptable now.
Thanks.

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