

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_97998
Title of the Manuscript:	Dermatomyositis: A case report and review of clinically diagnosed rare autoimmune disease.
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. Dermatomyositis is a rare autoimmune disorder. This article highlights importance of clinical examination and basic lab investigations in diagnosis of this treatable condition in a resource constraint setting.</p> <p>2. Yes, suitable</p> <p>3. The second para of abstract discusses about differential diagnosis may be cut short if necessary.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. Yes, sufficient. But reference number 13 in page 5 comes after reference number 10, it is not in order, that needs correction.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Recommended for publication after minor corrections pointed above.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. G. Padmanaban
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Dr. Mgr Medical University, India