

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_105073
Title of the Manuscript:	Infectious dermatoses in Ziguinchor (Senegal): Epidemiological, clinical and evolutionary particularities
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalajrdes.com/index.php/AJRDES/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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the subject is of interest to researchers.</p> <p>The title should be: Infectious dermatoses in Ziguinchor (Senegal): Epidemiological, clinical and evolutionary peculiarities</p> <p>The abstract is not comprehensive as there is lack of statistical evaluation of the data</p> <p>The subsections are not well described. For instance there is no mention of ethical approval for the study. Again the methodology is weak, and then the data analysis is not reported. There are no tables, to breakdown the findings and the results are poorly compared with that of other related works. In my opinion the manuscript is not scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references can be improved, based on comparison of this study with other related studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. There is need for extensive grammatical overhaul of the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Figure 1 should be placed in the introduction, while figure 2 should be placed in the results section.</p> <p>Table 1 and 2 should be moved into the results section.</p> <p>The other figures should be in another folder named: Supplementary materials.</p> <p>Also in Figure 7, the upper facial part inclusive of the eyes of the child should be shaded to conceal identity.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johnson-Ajinwo, Okiemute Rosa
Department, University & Country	University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria