

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRDES_129753 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Clinicopathological study of pityriasis alba in Libyan patients |
| 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | The study on topic like Pityriasis alba holds significant importance in scientific community, as it focuses on common yet underdiagnosed dermatological conditions affecting children as well as adolescents. Additionally, as in this study both males and females of different age group were participants, so better unbiased results were obtained, which is important for scientific community. Moreover, this paper can provide the multi dimensional approach in understanding the clinical features of Pityriasis alba, which inturn might help in the betterment of management strategies of the disease. Another important aspect of this study is that, it is ethically approved by the Hospital Ethical Committee, so there is no moral issues reagarding the study. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is quite perfect. | |
| 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 manuscript is well balanced both with literature and experimental data. But in my opinion addition of statistical data to the abstract will enhance its quality. Hence, it will grab more attention in the scientific community. Additionally, the headers in the abstract such as aim of the study, participants and methods should be marked in bold. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is absolutely correct because in one hand, it has taken into account of disease history to record age, sex, duration of lesions, history of recurrence, history of atopic dermatitis, atopy and family history of atopy, times of bathing, number of sun exposure and sunscreen usage and on the otherhand determination of skin type, xerosis, number of lesions and the site involved by dermatological examination is also studied. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | As far history or early findings of the disease is concerned, the somewhat old papers plays a major role in providing the background of the disease. The manuscripts contains some of the recent as well as very recent references which makes it quite rich in information and in designing the study. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | For scholarly communication the manuscript is quite well written in English as well as the quality is decent enough. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | The manuscripts is written well enough. But to add more richness to this content, I prefer to see the results section both data and graphical representation part side by side. For this may be the graphs will get somewhat squeezed but overall the impact will be much higher. | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Name: | Pronoy Das |
| Department, University & Country | India |