



Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35907
Title of the Manuscript:	TineaCapitis in Patients Attending Zliten Teaching Hospital (North West of Libya)
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 <i>(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)</i>
--	---------------------------	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

Compulsory REVISION comments	The authors analysed the prevalence of tineacapitis in North-West of Libya. This study is of some importance, however, the authors should better explain some aspects of their work: 1. About one third of cases were not confirmed by the culture. Were all these case positive in microscopic examination? 2. Table 2 - what the p-values refers to? 3. Some cases were demonstrated as caused by moulds. It is rather unusual (or even not occurring) - how it was proven, that these agents were indeed a cause of tinea, rather than just a contamination. 4. Figures: beside the culture please provide also a photo of the microscopic examination. 5. Figure 8 - please include only these cases, which had positive culture results. 6. No data on treatment was provided. It is important especially for those cases, who were culture negative.	The patients were suspected clinically and confirmed through KOH, or culture and were treated with Griseofulvin or Terbinafine systematically and all used to confirm that the condition was dermatophyte infection of scalp hairs. Moulds were all considered as contamination and removed from results.
Minor REVISION comments	Table 1 is not necessary as it is a repetition of the information provided in the text.	
Optional/General comments	English would benefit from careful editing.	