

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_81254
Title of the Manuscript:	Bacterial Content of Acne vulgaris and its Antimicrobial Susceptibility
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>Missing inclusion criteria. What population did the authors decide to include in the study (e.g., age)? Were subjects/participants already diagnosed as having Acne? What type of acne? Although you can tell those patients were having pustular acne and nodulocystic inflammatory acne lesions this should be stated in the inclusion criteria. What severity of acne authors decided to include? Who did the diagnosis? Were patients being treated? Or have patients received any antibiotics (topical or systemic) in the past? Was it reviewed whether patients were taking/applying antibiotics during sampling?</p> <p>Was ethical approval sought for this study? Why patients without acne were included "while 1, 5, 3 and 0 were the number of subjects found to be without acne"? Is this study a case-control study? If so, this must be informed in the material and methods, and this should be clarified in the inclusion criteria (missing from the methodology).</p> <p>It is confusing when there are no further specifications to whom groups of age the prevalence belongs: "prevalence of Acne vulgaris based on these age groups was therefore gotten to be 3%, 67%, 10% and 5%." Also, Figure 1 should be referenced in this sentence.</p> <p>In results: "This implies that Staphylococcus aureus is the major possible cause of Acne vulgaris." This is not completely true. S. aureus is not the major possible cause, and more controlled studies with a larger population would be needed to reach such a conclusion. Acne cause as the authors mentioned earlier is multifactorial.</p> <p>The discussion section should inform about the skin flora composition in acne and healthy skin, and whether it may be modified should patients have been on antibiotics. Then authors should discuss what their results mean in that context.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Missing reference (last paragraph of introduction): "Many individuals have made research on this topic, but only a few have clearly accounted the involvement of bacteria in Acne vulgaris"	
Optional/General comments	There is a lack of methodology.	

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:	Sylvia Aide Martinez Cabriaes
Department, University & Country	University of Toronto, Canada And Autonomous University of Nuevo Leon, Mexico