

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCRMH_115141</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>GENERALIZED BULLOUS PEMPHIGOID AND GLYCAEMIC CONTROL IN THE GERIATRIC AGE GROUP: A CASE REPORT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><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>	<p><b>Manuscript is important for the scientific community. The association of DM with BP was there in the 1970s and the 1980s and the prevalence got more attention with many case reports and observational studies documenting increased association with the treatments of DPPI-4i.</b></p> <p><b>Title is not suitable. A suitable title would be: Cases of BP in elderly patients with uncontrolled glycaemia</b></p> <p><b>The descriptive abstract is poorly written. Needs to provide a clear overview of the content and detailing its gist in detail.</b></p> <p><b>The subsections and structure is okay</b></p> <p><b>The manuscript is not scientifically clear to be correct. Meaning we know there is association between poor glycaemic control and BP but his manuscript is not making it clear</b></p> <p>Benzaquen M, Borradori L, Berbis P.et al.Dipeptidyl peptidase-IV inhibitors, a risk factor for bullous pemphigoid. Retrospective multicenter case-control study in France and Switzerland.</p> <p><i>J Am Acad Dermatol.</i> 2018;<a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2017.12.038">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2017.12.038</a></p> <p>Chuang T.Y, Korkij W, Soltani K, Clayman J, Cook J. <b>Increased frequency of diabetes mellitus in patients with bullous pemphigoid: a case-control study.</b> <i>J Am Acad Dermatol.</i> 1984; <b>11</b>: 1099-1102</p> <p><b>The Harvard referencing format is not correct and needs amendments.</b></p> <p>Spontaneous BP characterised by increased eosinophils in the dermal region compared with DPP-4i induced BP. The image shown in case one does not indicate the level of eosinophils and only shows cleavages of the dermis junction.</p> <p>The glycaemic control in case one by HBA1c is not documented so we don't know if this case glycaemic control is optimal or suboptimal. The second case HBA1c is pretty good for his age. That would not be an association of poor glycaemic control with BP</p> <p>There is no mention of the use of DPP-4i in both cases. Further, there are no mention of chronic complications of diabetes in these two cases. Skin lesions in diabetes including BP is very rare. The</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	microvascular complications are very common among poorly controlled diabetes patients and the lack of mention of vascular complication is echoing.  The type of diabetes is also not mentioned in these two cases	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The English language is not scholarly and needs refining to meet the publishable stage.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The subject (BP among poorly controlled glycaemic patients) is publishable. However, there is lack of clear documentation of association between poor glycaemic control and BP in these two cases. Further the English in the manuscript is not at the scholarly level to be published until further review and answers to the additional comments above are submitted to the editor.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Leslie Bahn Kawa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>United Kingdom</b>