

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_98746
Title of the Manuscript:	Aquagenic Urticaria, a case report
Type of the Article	Data 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.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>My view is that this manuscript is important for scientific community. Since reported behaviour is rare but worth being informed about.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title is suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract is comprehensive.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The construction of the manuscript is appropriate.</b></li> <li>5. <b>It is scientifically correct.</b></li> <li>6. <b>It would be better if some newer papers could be added.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Its English quality is suitable for manuscript.</b></p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This paper is a very interesting case report. However, I would like the authors to add their consideration regarding the following two points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Difference between sites where rash developed and unaffected sites despite contact to water. e.g. how about periorbital regions that is one of the most affected sites in contact urticaria?</li> <li>2. Pathology of pruritic follicular papules which are not seen in ordinary urticaria. Does this mean that causative agents were not easily absorbed transepidermally but via follicles.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tokio Nakada</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Showa University Fujigaoka Hospital, Japan</b>