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.99780
Published in: Journal of Skin and Stem Cell: 6(3); e99780

Peer Review Report for "Protocol for Collection, Culture, and Characterization of Human Skin Stem Cells"

Author(s): Anil Kumar, Somesh Gupta, Sujata Mohanty

Review Timeline:

Submit Date: 29 Nov 2019
Revised Date: 21 Jan 2020
Accepted Date: 26 Feb 2020

Revision (0)

Here, you can see the **Reviewers**, **Associate Editors** and **EICs'** comments from the beginning to the end of the revision process.

Ilma Robo: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 19 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
Seems an article of interest, only because the author appears in the same place (article), several protocols for the culture of human stem cells.
- Beyond that, I do not understand why it should be mentioned, the 39-piece cuticle sample, received from the Infantile Surgery Department, when the continuation of the article does not speak of further quantitative results.
- I find the part of the discussion not very attractive either. I claim to have written applications of these protocols or any other discussion in the field, but of interest to the reader.
- References are few in number and with the closest the year 2016, when there are numerous references and articles written by professionals in this field.
- References are not presented in the paragraphs of the article.
- As for protocols, since they are authentic, information must be placed at the bottom of each, such as working group, institution ... etc, in order to be safe copyright!
Thanks.

REFEREE: Reviewer | Revision (0) — 23 Dec 2019

Dear AE,
This manuscript doesn't have any data related to the experimental study thus it is difficult to evaluate the validity of the findings. The manuscript also needs English language editing.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2019

Dear EIC,
The authors should consult with a native English editor to refine grammatical errors in their manuscript.
in the reference section, just 6 reference papers inserted. They should add new references from 2013-2020.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (0) 24 Dec 2019

Dear Author,
Please revise the manuscript based on reviewers and associated editor comments.
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:

Seems an article of interest, only because the author appear in the same place (article), several protocols for culture of human stem cells.

Beyond that, I do not understand why it should be mentioned, the 39-piece cuticle sample, received from the Infantile Surgery Department, when the continuation of the article does not speak of further quantitative results.

I find the part of the discussion not very attractive either. I claim to have written applications of these protocols or any other discussion in the field, but of interest to the reader.

References are few in number and with the closest year 2016, when there are numerous references and articles written by professionals in this field.

References are not presented in the paragraphs of the article.

As for protocols, since they are authentic, information must be placed at the bottom of each, such as working group, institution ... etc, in order to be safe copyright!

Reply:

The mention of 39 pieces of the cuticle has been removed, as the article is only about the protocol and not the further investigation which were done.

Discussion has been updated and has been written in a context orientation. Hope it meets the standards of the Journal.

References have been improved with addition of latest investigations in the field. Hope they are appropriate.

Reviewer 2:

This manuscript doesn't have any data related to your experimental study thus it is difficult to evaluate the validity of the findings. The manuscript also needs English language editing.

Reply: This article only talks about the protocol hence we have not touched upon the findings of the experimental study. English language has been edited.

Associate Editor's Comments:

Associate Editor 1:
Please consult with a native english editor for refine grammatical errors in your manuscript.
in the reference section, just 6 reference papers inserted. Please add new references from 2013-2020.

Reply:

English language of the manuscript has been improved and latest references have been incorporated.

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) 24 Feb 2020

Dear AE,
English language of the revised manuscript, as well as new references, got improved so it seems to be an acceptable manuscript version.
Thanks.

REFEREE: Associate Editor | **Revision** (1) 26 Feb 2020

Dear EIC,
The manuscript was revised correctly.
Thanks.

REFEREE: EIC | **Revision** (1) 26 Feb 2020

Dear Author,
The document is reviewed carefully by the reviewers. According to their comments and your revisions as requested, this manuscript is accepted.
Thanks.