

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_119810
Title of the Manuscript:	Skin Changes Due to Chronic Usage of Masks in Mask-Induced Acne Versus Acne Vulgaris Versus Non-Acne Patients: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study
Type of the Article	

[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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it analyzes the rising dermatological issue of "maskne," caused by prolonged mask-wearing during the COVID-19 pandemic. The study population focuses on healthcare professionals who are required to wear medical masks for extended periods due to the pandemic. It offers comparative data on skin parameters and microflora among individuals with mask-induced acne, acne vulgaris, and those without acne, providing valuable insights into dermatological health within the framework of public health. The current title "Skin Changes Due to Chronic Usage of Masks in Mask-Induced Acne Versus Acne Vulgaris Versus Non-Acne Patients: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study" accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, because the study is single-centered and cross-sectional, it is not designed to observe changes over time longitudinally. Therefore, the term "changes" may not be appropriate for the title. A more accurate alternative could be: "Skin Conditions in Mask-Induced Acne, Acne Vulgaris, and Non-Acne Patients with Chronic Mask Usage: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Study." The abstract provides a clear overview of the study's background, goals, methods, results, and conclusion. It clearly presents the research context and objectives, describes the different groups compared in the methodology, and highlights the key findings in the results section. This makes it easy for readers to understand the main points of the study. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, which starts with an introduction that explains the research background and objectives. It then details the methodology and the comparative results. Finally, the discussion section reviews recent related studies, addresses the strengths and limitations of this research, and interprets the results. Each section is clearly defined and supports the overall narrative of the study. The manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is detailed and follows ethical guidelines, the results are well-presented with statistical analysis, and the discussion aligns with the findings. The references are adequate and include current studies relevant to the topic. However, it may be beneficial to adopt more recent studies or reviews on the impact of prolonged mask usage on skin health after 2021. As the pandemic evolved, there were significant changes in the nature of the outbreak and in public health policies. These changes could have led to new insights and findings regarding the dermatological effects of long-term mask usage. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria: The inclusion and exclusion criteria should be detailed more thoroughly. Providing particular information on these criteria will help readers better understand the selection procedure for participants and the study's scope. Participant Screening and Composition: Include detailed information about the number of participants at each stage of the screening process. This includes initial recruitment numbers, exclusions due to specific criteria, and final participant numbers. This transparency will give readers a clearer picture of the participant composition and the study's representativeness. Baseline Characteristics: Provide a table listing the baseline characteristics of each group. This will help readers understand the composition of the participants and the differences between groups, adding depth to the comparative analysis. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and without major grammatical errors. Additionally, the manuscript effectively assigns and consistently uses group identifiers, ensuring there is no confusion or misuse of pronouns when referring to different groups. This clarity in language and structure helps maintain the precision and readability necessary for academic writing. Overall, the manuscript meets the standards for academic writing, but minor edits could further enhance its clarity and impact.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Overall Clarity: The manuscript clearly presents the objective of the research study. The logical flow from the introduction through to the conclusion helps in understanding the study's objectives, methodology, and findings.2. Figures and Tables: The inclusion of figures and tables with color differences that illustrate the study's findings enhances the manuscript. These visual aids effectively support the text.3. Discussion Section: The discussion is comprehensive, addressing recent related research, and it provides a balanced view of the study's strengths and limitations. This section interprets the results in the context of the existing literature.4. Practical Implications: The study's focus on healthcare workers and the impact of prolonged mask usage on their skin health is particularly relevant and crucial. This adds practical value to the research, highlighting its significance in the context of public health during the pandemic.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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:	Ting-Jia Wu
Department, University & Country	Taipei Medical University, Taiwan