

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_127335
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of Voriconazole among Dermatophyte Patients: An Observational Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article covers a very good topic. This issue is one of the current concerns of mycologists all over the world and is very important.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I think the title is appropriate and is responsible for the processes carried out.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is appropriate and the content is well described.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article follows a good topic and its different parts are acceptable.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript has good and new content in mycology. Addressing these issues in clinical work seems very necessary.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Authors can use better references in this study, some of which are mentioned below. 1-Voriconazole is superior to combined itraconazole/isotretinoin therapy and itraconazole monotherapy in recalcitrant dermatophytosis 2-Specific identification and antifungal susceptibility pattern of clinically important dermatophyte species isolated from patients with dermatophytosis in Tehran, Iran	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language is acceptable, but it will be better if it is edited by a native person.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	1- This article does not explain how to perform the tests? 2- With which criterion has the improvement of patients been evaluated or compared? 3- By what criteria is the severity of the disease evaluated? 4- In these cases, it seems necessary to isolate the fungus and determine drug sensitivity	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abozar Nasiri-Jahrodi
Department, University & Country	School of Medicine North Khorasan University, Iran