



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	1. There are too many fallacies in this manuscript which i have mentioned in the Pdf file 2. Dosage regimens of the 3 drugs – no substantiation; fluconazole 150 mg/ week only for 2 weeks is incomplete dosage duration 3. With regard to itraconazole, there has been no mention about whether the same brand was used for all the patients, because there is a serious issue in our country about the efficacy and bioavailability of this molecule. 4. There is no mention about the use of topical steroid antifungal combination creams which is again a major issue these days. Erythema is more often a feature of tinea incognito. Tinea incognito lesions would require prolonged treatment 5. In the current scenario, it is unlikely that patients responded to 2 weeks of terbinafine. There was no complete clinical cure. Zero score was not achieved for any of the parameters 6. KOH and culture results have not been furnished. KOH positivity should be one of the inclusion criteria. 7. Culture positivity and details of the isolates have not been mentioned. There has been no mention about <i>T.mentagrophytes</i> 8. Drop out details has not been mentioned. 9. There are no picture proofs 10. References are incomplete. Text book references – old editions have been mentioned	1. Gone through them and made necessary changes sir/mam. 2. Sir, we had actually given fluconazole 150mg/wk for 4 wks. But in the present study we had followed up all patients of all the three drug groups after 2wks. So I had to mention it as 2 wks. 3. All the patients were prescribed same brands of terbinafine, fluconazole and itraconazole. 4. Patients who had used topical steroids were also excluded from the study 5. We had excluded patients with extensive dermatophytosis and patients who had used topical steroids and those who took incomplete treatments. So that could be the reason for response to terbinafine 2wks. 6. KOH and culture positivity were included in the inclusion criteria. 7. Included sir/mam 8. Included sir/mam 9. Included sir/mam 10. Corrected sir/mam
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		