

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Pediatric Research                                             |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJPR_96269                                                                   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Linear Psoriasis: A Rare and Often Underdiagnosed Form of Psoriasis in Children |
| 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

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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.<br/><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>1. Of value to remind</p> <p>2. No. Actually not a form, but a manifestation.</p> <p>3. Ok</p> <p>4. Ok</p> <p>5. Ok, as far as it goes</p> <p>6. Somewhat limited and does not address Koebner phenomenon</p> |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <p>1. Language ok but major revision to incorporate Koebner phenomena discussion</p>                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>What is being described is classic Koebner phenomena, well known in psoriasis. That must be documented in this manuscript with discussion of possible derivation in this individual</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) |
|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |                                                                                                                                                                               |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                  |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| Name:                            | Bruce Rothschild |
| Department, University & Country | IU Health, USA   |