

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRDES_123410</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Long-Term Effectiveness and Discontinuation of Dupilumab in Patients With Atopic Dermatitis: A Literature Review</b>
Type of the 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>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Monoclonal Therapy and atopic dermatitis is a topic that have a great debate in the literature. This therapy has changed the management of some chronic disease like CRSwNP, AD etc. etc. The quality of life and the course of disease are changed by the effects of these new therapies maintaining a good safety profile.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	It's correct	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 title and abstract are consistent. The study design is adequate and reproducible. The methodology and the results reported are solid. The discussion is well-argued. The conclusion supported the results reported.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Cosimo Galletti
Department, University & Country	Università degli Studi "Kore" Enna, Italy