

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_79625
Title of the Manuscript:	All variants of lichen planus are triggering factors for squamous cell carcinoma
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrdes.com/index.php/AJRDES/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>As this is proposed as the original paper, I have some important comments: The main disadvantage of the paper is extremely small study sample. There is no information where these patients come from – ambulatory care or hospital? The lack of written consent is very surprising for me and in my opinion oral consent is not sufficient if we enroll patients into the study which is going to be published. Limitations section should be expanded because there are more limitations than mentioned, e.g. authors cannot draw definite conclusions about the necessity of screening for SCC in all LP types because the sample size is too small. They can only make suggestion for future studies. The title would have to be changed – it strongly suggests that all LP types trigger SCC and it is obvious, whereas it is not and cannot be stated basing on only 8 subjects. English improvement is mandatory, there are grammar and punctuation mistakes.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>The idea for the study is very interesting and worth investigating, especially since it concerns a very important issue of cancer. I would be happy to follow the implications of the paper if it concerned many more subjects and drawing conclusions would be possible. There are very nice photographs that enrich the whole paper. I would recommend expanding the study by recruiting more patients, maybe also from different dermatology units, to obtain bigger study group, which would make the paper more eligible and publishable. Perhaps this paper should be considered to be published as a case series, not original paper. In that case, I would recommend acceptance after some minor revisions.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Julia Nowowiejska</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Medical University Of Bialystok, Poland</i>