



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRDES_46057 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | The role of mycology laboratory in management of superficial fungal infections in Zliten Teaching 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 | <p>Page 2: "40 patients out of 54 patients". Why not 84? Justification at discussion about the inexperience of all dermatologists is not convincing. Are the authors responsible of the study, or they just collect data from the microbiology lab?</p> <p>The identification methods: of the different fungi described at result should be briefly described</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>English editing needed. Numerous grammatical errors.</p> <p>The use of chloramphenicol instead of cycloheximide should be justified. The argument "there was no cycloheximide available" is poor for publishing any contribution.</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>The manuscript is written as successive short sentences. The text should have continuity and not a succession of short sentences.</p> <p>Sentences in introduction should not be identical to the summary.</p> <p>The first paragraph of discussion about the mean age in comparison to other study is useless. I suggest deletion.</p> <p>Figures 3 to 7 should be replaced at the results section rather than discussion. A panel with just a Figure and different examples (3a, 3b, 3c..) should be more appropriate than different Figures.</p> | |

PART 2:

| | 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) |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Name: | <i>F. Solano</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Universidad de Murcia, Spain</i> |