

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_98391
Title of the Manuscript:	An impressive dyskeratosis: Case report and literature review
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <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>Yes, it's important. The report is well written with all the details and it is also important and scientifically correct since Pachioniquia congenita as a rare disease, may be a source of diagnostic confusion.</p> <p>I would change the title, it's a bit confounding.</p> <p>Something like: "Pachyonychia congenita: an impressive dyskeratosis: Case report and literature review.</p> <p>Or : Pachyonychia congenita: case report and literature review</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It's very well written and understandable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cesar Bimbi
Department, University & Country	Brazil