

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98691
Title of the Manuscript:	Stevens-Johnson syndrome secondary to herpetic infection, a case report
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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Partly. It is a description of a case with Stevens-Johnson syndrome which is a severe medical condition. However, it is a weak report because of its superficial contents. More improvement if needed to raise the quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>The title is acceptable. However, more description in the text is needed to make the contents fit with the title (please see below).</p> <p>This is a poor abstract. This manuscript is the report of a case with Stevens-Johnson syndrome. There is no description about the case at all. Among the 8 lines of the abstract, only 2 lines introducing the case without any medical information.</p> <p>The structure of the manuscript is acceptable. There is a need to improve the contents, as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Introduction is too short. Readers should get information about the syndrome, the existing knowledge on the association between the syndrome and herpes infection (with the details on affected organs of herpes infection with the aimed to demonstrated that herpetic keratoconjunctivitis case is not common or has not been reported before) and the treatment outcomes of cases (herpes infection with Stevens-Johnson syndrome) in the literature. In the section on "Presentation of the Case", the author has to convince readers that the SJ syndrome was a secondary condition of herpes infection of the case. More information is needed to differentiate between "association" (happened together at the same time) and "causation" (herpes infection is the cause of SJ syndrome, as the term 'secondary' implies). Some paragraphs in the "Discussion" introducing the SJ syndrome should be moved to the "Introduction" section except the parts linking the syndrome with herpes infection. More discussion is recommended to compare the clinical findings and treatment outcomes with the similar cases of SJS-herpes in the literature. <p>Yes. But proper revision should be performed to make the manuscript correctly described (see the item 4 above).</p> <p>More references are needed to compare the current case with the ones previously reported in the literature (the SJS-Herpes cases).</p> <p>None except the correct spelling of "Stevens Johnson syndrome" in the first line of "Introduction" which should be "Stevens-Johnson syndrome"</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	OK	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wiwat Rojanapithayakorn
Department, University & Country	ASEAN Institute of Health Development, Mahidol University, Thailand