



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17045
Title of the Manuscript:	UNUSUAL FINDINGS IN MORGELLONS DISEASE AND DELUSIONS OF PARASITOSIS
Type of the Article	Case Report

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:

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



SDI 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	Abstract should be structured as per journal guidelines. Length of article is more than 2000 words. Hence it should be edited as per journal requirements. Repetition of sentences in case history and physical examination in case 1 can be avoided. Discussion can include reference to the use of other atypical antipsychotics for the treatment of delusional parasitosis with good results. Summary can be deleted. Photographs exceed the number allowed by the journal. Photographs 2,4, 5 and 8 can be deleted. References should be written as per journal instructions. Ethical issues-: Have the authors attached the patient consent forms for all the photographs?	We thank the reviewer for useful suggestions. We have revised the mss in accordance with all of the comments. 1. The mss text has been shortened to 1383 words from over 2000 words. 2. The repetition of sentences in case 1 has been eliminated. 3. The discussion includes references to other treatments reported in the literature. 4. The summary has been completely deleted. 5. Photographs 2, 4,5 and 8 have been deleted. 6. The references have been redone in accordance with journal instructions. 7. All photographs are cropped or otherwise unrecognizable maintaining ethical issues. 8. Yellow highlighting has been done wherever possible to indicate where revisions have been made. This of course was not possible where entire sections or complete eliminations were done according to the reviewers comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		