

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3136
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical variants of Pityriasis Rosea and PR-like rashes produced by drugs or after COVID-19 infection/vaccination
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As COVID-19 and its vaccines are relatively new, documenting adverse skin reactions can help in understanding the broader implications in the field of dermatology. The review can provide insights into the pathophysiology of pityriasis rosea, especially in the context of viral infections or immune responses triggered by medicines. Documenting these reactions can highlight areas for further research, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between infections, vaccinations, and dermatological conditions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Unravelling the clinical forms of Pityriasis Rosea and PR-like rashes induced by pharmaceuticals or subsequent to COVID-19 infection/vaccination.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes it is ok. No further correction are needed in abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes the structure is good. Table no. 1 should be properly prepared with serial nos.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Some more elaboration may needed for immunologic markers used in the diagnosis. This manuscript demonstrates strong scientific rigor through its vast interpretation about PRs. The information presented is clearly visualized and aligns with the pathophysiology of PR, making it a technically sound contribution to the field of dermatology.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are found to be recent and more than sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language quality is suitable for this article.	
Optional/General comments	NA	

[Review Form 2](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arnab Chakraborty
Department, University & Country	Adamas University, India