

### Review Form 3

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

#### **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>

#### **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>
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the underexplored efficacy of voriconazole in treating dermatophyte infections, a prevalent public health concern. By providing data on clinical outcomes and tolerability, the study contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting the use of newer antifungal agents in managing drug-resistant fungal infections. Its findings may guide dermatologists in optimizing treatment regimens, thus improving patient care. However, the study could benefit from a larger sample size and more robust statistical analyses to strengthen its conclusions. Overall, it offers valuable insights while highlighting areas for further research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	This title is more suitable for the manuscript "Evaluating the Efficacy and Safety of Voriconazole in the Treatment of Dermatophyte Infections: A Cross-Sectional Observational Study".  This alternative title highlights both the efficacy and safety aspects and specifies the study design, providing a more complete picture of the manuscript's focus.	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is well-structured and provides a good overview of the study. However, there are areas where it could be improved for clarity and comprehensiveness:</p> <p><b>Additions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Study Objectives:</b> Explicitly state the primary objective of the study in the introduction of the abstract (e.g., <i>"This study aimed to evaluate both the efficacy and safety of voriconazole in treating dermatophyte infections."</i>).</li><li>2. <b>Details on Side Effects:</b> Mention the incidence rate of side effects (e.g., <i>"Side effects occurred in X% of patients."</i>), as this adds depth to the tolerability discussion.</li><li>3. <b>Statistical Analysis:</b> Briefly state if any statistical methods were applied to evaluate the outcomes.</li></ol> <p><b>Modifications</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>Baseline Lesion Severity:</b> While helpful, the breakdown of severity (moderate/severe) could be briefly summarized to save space, e.g., <i>"Most patients had moderate to severe lesions."</i></li><li>2. <b>Software Mention:</b> The reference to MS Office as the analytical tool is not necessary in the abstract. Focus on the methodology itself rather than the tools used.</li></ol> <p><b>Additional Suggestions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include a brief note on limitations if space permits, such as the relatively small sample size or lack of long-term follow-up data.</li><li>• Avoid repetition of terms like "new" and "newer molecule" in the conclusion for a more professional tone.</li></ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate and follow the conventional format for scientific research articles (Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and References). However, there are areas where improvements can enhance the organization, clarity, and adherence to standard scientific conventions.</p> <p><b>1. Abstract</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Clearly state the study objective.</li><li>2. Avoid adding unnecessary details like the use of MS Office for data analysis.</li><li>3. Include a brief limitations or recommendations for future studies.</li></ol> <p><b>2. Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Your introduction should be more concise by focusing on key points directly relevant to the study's objectives.</li><li>2. Your conclusion should be with a clear statement of the study objective to set the stage for the following sections.</li></ol> <hr/> <p><b>3. Methodology</b></p> <p>Divide into subsections for clarity and to be easy for readers to locate specific information such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <i>Study Design and Setting</i></li><li>2. <i>Patient Selection (Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria)</i></li><li>3. <i>Clinical and Laboratory Assessments</i></li><li>4. <i>Treatment Protocol</i></li><li>5. <i>Data Analysis</i></li></ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p><b>4. Results</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organize the content into logical subsections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographics</li> <li>Baseline Clinical Characteristics</li> <li>Treatment Outcomes</li> <li>Side Effects</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ensure all figures and tables are numbered, labeled, and cited in the text appropriately.</li> <li>Interpret the data briefly in this section, leaving more in-depth discussion for the Discussion section.</li> </ol> <p><b>5. Discussion</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subdivide into: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparison with Previous Studies: Explain how findings align or differ from existing literature.</li> <li>Clinical Implications: Discuss how voriconazole's efficacy can influence treatment guidelines.</li> <li>Limitations: Address study limitations, such as sample size, lack of randomization, or absence of a control group.</li> <li>Recommendations: Provide suggestions for future research or clinical application.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>6. Conclusion</b></p> <p>Expand slightly to emphasize the clinical relevance and suggest broader implications for dermatology practice.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach to studying the efficacy of voriconazole in treating dermatophyte infections. The study design is clear, with a well-defined population and treatment protocol, allowing for reliable observations. The use of appropriate endpoints, such as lesion healing and side effects, provides meaningful clinical outcomes that can guide therapeutic decisions. Additionally, the manuscript is supported by relevant literature references, enhancing the validity of its findings and situating them within the broader scientific context. However, attention to study limitations and a comparative analysis with other antifungal therapies could further strengthen its scientific foundation.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>The cited studies are relevant and support the manuscript's claims.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Nil</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Charity Ndidi Obum-Nnadi</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Abuja, Nigeria</b></p>