

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_86627
Title of the Manuscript:	A CASE REPORT ON HERPES ZOSTER
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title is correct although not descriptive enough. 2. International guidelines indicate different dosing regimens from the one used by the authors. However they probably wanted to indicate the efficacy of lower dosage antivirals in combination with anti-inflammatory drugs and I believe that if so, it should be more prevalent to the reader. As it is, the manuscript lacks the aim of this case presentation. 3. The structure of the text seems overall well organized but there are areas that need to be separated eg. at the end of the discussion paragraph, the authors start the description of the figures... (it should be in a different paragraph) 4. Conclusion needs to be more appealing. The goal was for the patient to be treated of course but what was the aim of this case presentation? What made it so interesting for the authors? Herpes zoster is quite common in Dermatology daily practice and departments. This needs to be clearly remarked in the conclusion of the paper. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Several syntactical and typographical mistakes that I have included as comments in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	It could be an interesting point of view in terms of treatment options but it needs major revision.	

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:	Dimitra Zafeiratou
Department, University & Country	Andreas Syggros University Hospital, Greece