

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_95891
Title of the Manuscript:	Kaposi Julius-berg syndrome on congenital ichthyosis, about a case
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.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>1. The article has lot of grammatical and spacing errors.</p> <p>2. Abstract does not have celerity of the work, lack of key information about the research.</p> <p>3. The abstract conclusion is irrelevant to the article.</p> <p>4. Introduction section needs referencing for all the statements given. Most of the statements are not relevant to context.</p> <p>5. Ethical clearance needs to be presented</p> <p>6. Patients concern needs to be addressed.</p> <p>7. Why only Aciclovir has taken as drug of choice, why not other antiviral drugs.</p> <p>8. What is the theocratical dose of the Aciclovir.</p> <p>9. Why no topical steroid or Antiviral were applied to supress the infection.</p> <p>10. Discussion parts are not relevant to the current study. Referencing need for the all the statements.</p> <p>11. Reference section need to be rewritten.</p> <p>12. Lack of novelty and statements expression.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gunasekar Manoharan
Department, University & Country	New Jersey Bio Science Centre, USA