



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_35907
Title of the Manuscript:	Tinea Capitis 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>)



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	Abstract is more or less informative and give reasonable insight into the study. However there are some notice eg; - Avoid <i>acronyms</i> in the abstract - No abbreviation in the abstract unless used 3 times or more - The abbreviation (T.) can't be applied for two words (tinea - trichophyton) in the same article and must be stand for only for either one (usually for trichophyton). - Throughout the text -Always spell out the <i>acronym</i> the first time it is used in the body of the paper. However, abbreviations used only once or twice should be spelled out in full. -Some paragraphs are small in size and can better be added to one another. -The paper needs grammar and language revision -Remove/replace redundant word(s), phrase(s) or sentence(s) when applicable. -There is lack of standardization of writing (eg, grey – gray). In the introduction: -tinea capitis is caused by 6 species of dermatophytes [3]. This old data (year 2000) should be updated. You already have isolated more than 6 dermatophyte species!!! In the methods section: -You must mention different patient groups in the methodology -"In positive cases the growth were subcultured on to sabourauds dextrose agar petri dishes without antibiotics". What are the benefits you are getting from subculture??? In the result section: "Clinical types were documented in 49 patients" -You must include the remaining 11 patients under any clinical category of tinea capitis. The term "not documented" in this situation is not logic and not accepted in the text and the tables 1 and 2!!! In the discussion: - NDMs have no role in pathogenesis of tinea capitis, their role in this disease is unaccepted by any qualified researcher(s) References: - Need standardization.eg, in some you mention 4 and 5 authors and in others you write only 3 followed by et al -Some authors are written without initials eg, ref no 2	Abstract all instructions are considered as advised. Throughout text Revised and corrected and standardized as needed. In the introduction: Updating with use of references from 2011 is done. References 3 and 4. Methodology Different ages are added in methodology. *In positive cases the Subculture was done to get pure colonies of isolated organism for accurate macro and microscopic identification of those isolated organisms. In the results All cases were clinically categorized. In the discussion NDMs have no role in the pathogenesis of tinea capitis and now is completely removed. References Were corrected and standardized.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I found the article is not well-written and the language is redundant in many sites. There is lack of standardization of writing method. I recommend this for publication only after major revisions be corrected satisfactorily.	