Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRDES_84825**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ADOLESCENTS' SKIN CARE VISITS: A TEN YEAR REVIEW**
Type of the Article	**Review**

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	Table 1, Table 2, and Figure 2 should be joined in just one Table. These data are almost the same. Absolutely unnecessary. Something similar can be applied to Table 3 and Figure 3. This is an example of flipping around the same data. Please, reduce the results section.	
Minor REVISION comments	It is not necessary to repeat the period of observing cases in the introduction. Has the approval of the officer in charge of the records to obtain the needed data any reference document?. If so, please include for ethical reasons.	
Optional/General comments	The conclusions are poor and not surprising. This is the list of the most common types of adolescent skin diseases. Anyway, according to Table 5, these are around 50% of the total diagnosis, and this should be mentioned. Any effort to highlight the 3 or 4 of higher incidence, including %, would be welcome. On the other hand, a sentence concerning the other 50%, including some inherit genetic diseases, fungal and viral infections and so on, could be added to enrich the conclusion. Discussion is complete, and compared with other similar studies, but conclusion reflects a small part of Table 5 and the long discussion.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* Not really, but the approval of any ethical committee would be welcome.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**F. Solano**
Department, University & Country	**University of Murcia, Spain**