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.116498
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 7(4); e116498

Peer Review Report for "Evaluation of Reliability and Validity of Persian Version of Children's Dermatology Life Quality Index (CDLQI) Questionnaire and Practical Use"

Author(s): Saman Mohammadi, Maryam Khalili, Saeedeh Farajzadeh, Hossein Safizadeh, Rezvan Amiri, Mahin Aflatoonian, Salilah Shahabi

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 24 May 2021
Revised Date: 21 Jun 2021
Accepted Date: 26 Jun 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) — 1 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
I found a lot of spelling mistakes that I comment it in the manuscript, the title must be changed because in that I see extra information that is not matched with the title.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | **Revision** (0) — 4 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
The authors should answer the following questions:
1- What is the exact age range of the subjects? 4 to 16, 5 to 16, or 5-15
2- In conclusion, there are no deficiencies in the study. Did this study have any deficiencies that need further investigation?
3- Has no new study been done on this in recent years? The last reference used is 2014.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 5 Jun 2021

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

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 5 Jun 2021

Dear Authors,
Minor 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.

:Dear reviewer

:Response to reviewer 1

Q1: What is the exact age range of the subjects? 4 to 16, 5 to 16 or 5-15

R1: The questionnaie (CDLQI) evaluates children between 4-16 years old. Thus, inclusion criteria of our study was AD children between 4-16 years old. However, enrolled children in .our study have age range of 5-15 years old

Q2: In conclusion, there are no deficiencies in the study. Did this study have any deficiencies ?that need further investigation

.R2: We mentioned limitations of our study at the end of our manuscript

.Q 3: Has no new study been done on this in recent years? The last reference used is 2014

.R3: We updated our references

:Response to reviewer 2

:Response to question1

Q: I found alot spelling mistake that i comment it in the manuscript.the title must be changed .because of in that i see extra information that is not matched with title

.R: We edited our manuscript and corrected spelling errors.We changed our title

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) — 23 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
Thanks for the attention to the shortcomings and the corrections.
Thanks.

Hojat Eftekhari: Reviewer | **Revision** (1) — 26 Jun 2021

Dear AE,
I think the corresponding author respond to my comments very well.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) — 26 Jun 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 Jun 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.