



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_41405
Title of the Manuscript:	“To assess the clinical efficacy and safety of oral Terbinafine, Fluconazole and Itraconazole in the treatment of tinea corporis in a tertiary care hospital”.
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	13,14,15: Difference in Dosage of 3 drugs should be explained. Difference in Dosage of 3 drugs: The variation in drug dosage should be substantiated with relevant references. 102: Explain the efficacy of drugs only on Trichophyton rubrum substantiate with reference and experimental results.	Reference 3
Minor REVISION comments	Tinea Corporis should be always written starting with small letters as it is an infection (i.e., tinea corporis)	Corrected sir/mam
Optional/General comments	55: Oral Anti fungals 73: Check the results on scale of 1 -3(either 1 may be designated as mild or absent or 1 is mild, 0 is absent) 101 of Dermatophytosis 102 T. Corporis: (It is not a genus and species (i.e., tinea corporis)) 223: Itracanazole efficacy is missing 224: Include flucanazole efficacy 250: Differential Grading instead of Differential of Grading	Corrected Grade 0- absent Corrected Corrected Itraconazole efficacy – 20% Fluconazole -55.6% 250: corrected sir/mam