

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_85564
Title of the Manuscript:	Case control study about psoriasis: A chronic inflammatory disorder of skin
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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript is written in understandable language. However, it must undergo professional academic English editing. It cannot be published without professional academic edition.2. All abbreviations must be mentioned first in full. Including PASI, BMI and so on. And once you mentioned the abbreviation, then please stick to it. For example do not mention NAFLD at the beginning and then jump to nan-alcoholic somewhere else in the text. Consistency is important.3. Title: The title is very broad and non-specific. Please make it concise. I suggest: Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease in psoriasis: a case control study.4. Abstract: the abstract is poorly-written. The background is very broad and some information should not be mentioned in the context of abstract. Please keep the background as short and concise as possible. Citations should not appear in abstract. Please mention, in one statement, the objective of your study under Background. In the methodology, please remove the consent issues and keep it only in the actual methodology section rather than the abstract. Methodology within the abstract should include the important information like inclusion and exclusion criteria in addition to the tools used in research. Please remove all unnecessary phrases like: "It is to be concluded that". I would suggest that wordcount in your abstract should not exceed 150 words.5. Introduction: this paper is submitted to a journal specialized in dermatology and you are reporting a very common skin condition. Describing the shape of lesions in psoriasis has no place. Please remove all general information like "This disease characterized by cutaneous manifestations as well-demarcated, erythematous plaques with adherent glistening scales."6. Methodology: The first statement should be about ethical approval. Please mention the full name of the approving body: This study is ethically approved by XXXX, reference number XXXX. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to recruitment. Then start new paragraph to state other details like the period and inclusion and exclusion criteria.7. Results: please double check the number in text and tables. There is inconsistency.8. Discussion: NAFLD is associated with other diseases like DM, obesity and so on. Such confounders must be included in the description of participants and failing to do so, mans that you are attributing all the findings of your study to psoriasis which is not true. This should be clearly stated in the weakness points.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. All abbreviations mentioned first as they appeared in the manuscript.2. Title: The title has been changed as with the comments of the reviewer.3. Abstract: The background has been changed and the word count is minimized to 246. The references has been deleted from the abstract.4. Introduction: The phrases of general information on skin lesion has been removed or re structures where applicable.5. Methodology: The first statement has been revised as per comments of reviewers. The rest method started with a new paragraph.6. Results: The tables and text were synchronizing and typing errors were omitted.7. Discussion: The diseases associated with NAFLD were stated in discussion as a weakness of the study.
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General 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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No there are no Ethical issues with this study, how so over the ERB was taken.