

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_83476
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Psoriasis Clinical Trials Landscape in India with Special Focus on Biologics
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:

(<https://www.journalajrdes.com/index.php/AJRDES/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Start keywords with capital letters.2. The first time you write the abbreviation in parentheses is enough and does not need to be repeated in later sections, such as (PEST) on page 3.3. Discussion must be modified, considering that several clinical trials have been performed and different drugs have been used in each plan, it was better to write the reported results of each plan and each drug in a table and finally make a comparison (final result, possible side effects, etc.).4. It is better to use tables and graphs.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Thank you, sir. I have made the changes in the key words.2. Thank you, sir, I have deleted the repetition of PEST.3. Sir, the table summarizes the basic information we could get from CTRI website. Each trial has different drugs and plan. If we create a table detailing all those, the table would be of about 100 rows (very big table). That would be out of scope of this paper. So, please, I apologize that we would not be able to fulfil this request.4. Thank you sir, I have already used 2 tables in the paper.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	