



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_24416
Title of the Manuscript:	An original study on Blaschkoid pityriasis rosea – one of the rarest atypical variants of this paraviral exanthem
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>)



SDI 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	Aim - In line 39: (Our aim is to) should be written as (Our aim was to). Results - In line 67: (507- Sentences don't start with numerals). - In line 71: (informed consents) I think it is (informed consent). I think every patient gives only one consent. - In line 85: (of the his) I think it is (of his) "the" should be omitted. - In line 94: (the abbreviations HIV, VDRL, ASOT must be written in full first). Figure 2 - In line 282: Figure 2 if quoted must be referenced. (eg, modified/quoted from ...)	Revised accordingly (line 41, page 3) Numerals: Revised accordingly (line 68, page 5) Informed consent: Revised accordingly (line 72, page 5) Of his: Revised accordingly (line 86, page 5) HIV, VDRL, ASOT: These terms are now written in full (lines 95-96, page 6) Figure 2: We acknowledged the source of the figure with the follows: "Figure 2 were modified from a figure published in the <i>DermNet</i> (www.dermnetnz.org/). We thank Associate Professor Amanda Oakley, the managing dermatologist of the webpage, for her generosity in waiving the fees for us to reproduce the figures for academic use. (lines 239-243, page 13) In the Figure legends, we revised the legend of Figure 2 to be: (This figure was modified from a figure published in the <i>DermNet</i> (www.dermnetnz.org/). Classical Blaschko's lines with the affected area of Patient 1 colour-filled in red." (page 21) If further quotes are necessary, please keep us informed.
Minor REVISION comments	Title and abstract Are well informative and give good insight into the study. However; - In line 10: (complications of patients) is better written as (complications in patients). - In line 18: (slight curved) is better written as (slightly curved). Introduction - In line 29: The title (Introduction) should be written bald (Introduction). - Introduction is somewhat short however it is meaningful. Materials and Methods	Complications in: Revised accordingly (line 7, page 2) Slightly curved: Revised accordingly (line 15, page 2) Title in bold: Revised accordingly (line 24, page 3) Introduction too short: We have rewritten the introduction, and increased the word count from 90 to 196 (lines 25-40, page 3).



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- In line 42: (serviced) is better written as (served) - In line 51: (pityriasis rosea) should be written as (PR) Results - In line 104: postinflammatory pigmentation. What type- hypo or hyper? - Although the description of Patient 1 is comprehensive, that of Patients 2 and 3 is comparably insufficient. Discussion - In line 122: (diagnoses) is better written as (diagnosis) - In line 151: (patient 1) why "p" is small while capital "Patient" in others. - In line 151: (distributions were) is better written as (distribution was) like that in line 153 - In line 158: (distributions of.... do not) is better written as (distribution of.... does not). - In lines 177 & 178: the repetition of the phrase "For some conditions such as" is not attractive. The second one can be written as " For lichen planus, both Blaschkoid-types and" - In lines 184 & 185: Our data is therefore the best proxy measure of PR in the community. This statement looks a pattern of promotion/propaganda!! References: OK Throughout the text Some paragraphs are small in size and can better be added to one another.	Served: Revised accordingly (line 45, page 4) PR: Revised accordingly (line 54, page 4) Pigmentation: It was hypopigmentation. We revised accordingly (line 108, page 6). We inserted sufficient clinical descriptions for Patients 2 and 3 accordingly (line 111, page 6 to line 141, page 8) Diagnosis: We revised such accordingly (line 147, page 8) Patient: We revised all "patient 1" to "Patient 1" in the clinical report on Patient 1 (line 77, page 5 to line 109, page 6) Distribution: We revised such accordingly (line 178, page 9) Distribution and does not: We revised such accordingly (line 189, page 10). For lichen planus: We revised such accordingly (line 208, page 10) Our data: We revised such to "We thus believe that our data should be representative of PR in the community." (lines 214 and 215, page 11) We revised the paragraphs for reasons for a diagnosis of Blaschkoid from previously four to currently two paragraphs (line 174, page 9 to line 190, page 10)
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I found the article well-written and balanced. I am pleased to recommend this for publication after minor revisions being corrected satisfactorily.	Many thanks. We shall follow the revisions as recommended by the reviewer any time.