

Review Form 3

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

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	This Chapter focused on the Atopic Dermatitis mostly which is common dermatitis and mainly focusing on the therapies as treatment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be reevaluated due to in this chapter no attempt has been made to incorporate any other potential future therapeutic applications.	
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.	Please check the abstract and conclusion, some sentences may be repeated here.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Not likely. Need some more subsections for a good understanding of all points.	
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.	This study provides insightful information about the molecular mechanism and potential future advancements in biological therapies appropriate for AD. With that, the data given for the Long-Term Effectiveness of Dupilumab is also relevant and appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article must be easy to understand for every person who is unaware of the specific terminology so based on this the author should use easy and understanding language.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Monisha Nath
Department, University & Country	Adamas University, India