

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Dermatological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRDES_84957
Title of the Manuscript:	ALTERATIONS IN SERUM LEVELS OF URIC ACID, UREA, CREATINE, POTASSIUM AND SODIUM IN YOUNG ADULT FEMALES WITH STRIAE DISTENSAE IN SOUTH EASTERN NIGERIA.
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. The authors should add at least a paragraph in the introduction with related references to support the idea that striae distensae is related to renal functions (or any linking or reason why the author wants to investigate this).</p> <p>2. Analytical Method: I would recommend the authors to rephrase this part as it is not in a format of a scientific article. e.g. "Some of these moves into a high energy state. When these excited atoms fall back to the ground state,..." seems more like the principle of the method rather than the description of the methodology.</p> <p>3. Please explain why creatinine and urea were subjected to correlation analysis but not other parameters? And the authors need to <u>explain more</u> of their findings in the discussion section.</p> <p>4. This study was done in Nigeria, were there any similar studies performed in other countries? If so, the authors may wish to compare their results with this study and discuss them.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. A few mistakes in the use of English that needs correction e.g. the misuse of capital letters, the use of prepositions, etc (I have corrected some of them in the manuscript). Please review the manuscript again for corrections.</p> <p>2. Please change the unit "mg/dl" into "mg/dL" (Capitalize the letter "L")</p> <p>3. There is a space between the numerical value and unit symbol, please correct it.</p> <p>4. There is a dissimilarity when mentioning the P-values, "P" or "p"? I would suggest the p is italicized.</p> <p>5. Analytical Methods: "Potassium and sodium solution under carefully controlled conditions,..." is not understandable.</p> <p>6. There is no need to use the bold letter to mention the chemistry parameters eg. sodium.</p> <p>7. In Tables 2 and 3, what does the symbol "*" mean? The authors should add a table legend.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ho Yin Pekkle Lam
Department, University & Country	Tzu Chi University, Taiwan