

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_105583
Title of the Manuscript:	Nicolau Syndrome: An Iatrogenic Drug Reaction Caused by Bupivacaine Injection as Spinal Anaesthesia
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.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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>the manuscript will be important for scientific community with some modification that have to be done</p> <p>yes is suitable</p> <p>the abstract is comprehensible but without methodology statistic results</p> <p>The structure is not a scientific structure but a literary one. the author describes the two cases without giving concrete and statistical results. the article is not correct since it is not based on tests with results and data is not enough.</p> <p>yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes it's good</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The authors must do major modification in the methodology and the presentation of the results must be done with statistical data. the discussion needs to be understood and better developed.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Sabour Alaoui Sanaa
Department, University & Country	Sultan Moulay Sliman University, Morocco