

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_98532
Title of the Manuscript:	Synthetic Antimalarial Maculopathy: a case series
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.journalajcrmh.com/index.php/AJCRMH/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1.Synthetic Antimalarial Maculopathy a case series is very much useful for scientific community because increase use of Synthetic Antimalarial drugs for treatment of certain rheumatological or dermatological pathologies such as rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and lupus. The series is useful in monitoring drug which is given for long term use. 2.Tital is suitable. 3.Abstract should structured, It should cover results ,discussion & conclusion. 4.It should consist aims ,objectives, inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria ,tables etc. 5.it is better with correction suggested. 6.References are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
Optional/General comments	Good topic.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Surendra Wadgaonkar
Department, University & Country	MUHS, India