



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Pharmaceutical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJPR_4348
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICAL EFFICACY OF TOPICAL TERBINAFFINE VERSUS TOPICAL LULICONAZOLE IN TREATMENT OF TINEA CORPORIS / TINEA CRURIS PATIENTS
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Overall good manuscript 1. Terbinafin (sic) was misspelled in a figure 2. A limitation of this study is that results were entirely based upon KOH results and not culture. KOH may not be as reliable and the ecology of tinea in the region was not presented. The authors should consider presenting these limitations	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer