

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_114469</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CLINICOPATHOLOGICAL CONSISTENCY IN THE DIAGNOSIS OF SKIN DISORDERS IN A TERTIARY CARE HOSPITAL IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA: A PROSPECTIVE STUDY.</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is. It emphasis the need for detailed clinical history to be sent to the histopathologists alongside differential diagnosis for any skin biopsy done.</p> <p>No, this is not a prospective study. There is no follow up on treatment received by the participants after the biopsies were done. It is a descriptive cross-sectional analysis.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and recent</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, it is</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There was no indication that parental consent was gotten for the minors. A possible explanation could have been given while the inconsistency exists. Would prior treatment or actions such as scratching be responsible for some of the inconsistencies? This can be discussed in relation to the results gotten.</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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ekechi Stella Amadi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rivers State University, Nigeria</b>