

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_96081
Title of the Manuscript:	Primary focal hyperhidrosis; treatments of thoracoscopic surgery
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>1. First of all, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally adequate, but need significant corrections.</p> <p>5. In my opinion, the introduction is too short and the bibliography is completely absent for most of it. Tables need to be made more understandable. Table titles are preferably at the top.</p> <p>Asterisks (*,**) do not refer somewhere inside tables. At some point in the Results it is stated that: Stress was associated with excessive sweating (p:0.04). What statistical test does this result derive from? On what scale was stress measured? Also the first paragraph of the Discussion would have been better suited to be in the Introduction. The comparisons of the results with the results of other studies are absent from the Discussion.</p> <p>At some point in the results it is stated that: "Thoracic sympathetic surgery was successful in the treatment of primary hyperhidrosis (p:0.01, Table II) and, there was no statistically significant difference between sympathectomy and sympathectomy (p:0.03)", which does not agree with the corresponding table.</p> <p>6. The bibliographic references are very few and old, (there is none from the last five years), both in the introduction and in the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I think the quality of the language of the article is suitable for scientific communication	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In general the manuscript should be revised in all subsections	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Christos Sykaras
Department, University & Country	Sotiria Thoracic Diseases Hospital of Athens, University of Peloponnese, Greece