

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_99557
Title of the Manuscript:	Successful treatment of Lipoid Proteinosis In a Young Adult with Isotretinoin.
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The manuscript is significant to the scientific community as it introduces a novel and efficacious treatment option for Lipoid Proteinosis, a rare ailment that lacks a definitive cure. 2. The title of the article is appropriate since it precisely conveys the manuscript's content. 3. The abstract is comprehensive since it briefly summarizes the disease, its symptoms, current therapies, and the effectiveness of isotretinoin in treating the disease. 4. The manuscript's subsections and structure are fitting since the authors adhered to a standard case study reporting format. 5. The treatment approach employed appears to be scientifically valid and efficient based on the data presented in the manuscript. 6. The references cited are recent and adequate, and the authors have referenced relevant studies to support their results. There is no need for additional references.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript seems to be written in standard English with appropriate grammar and syntax. However, a language expert in scientific writing must conduct a thorough evaluation of the language quality.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Frih Hacene
Department, University & Country	Badji Mokhtar University, Algeria