

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58310

Title: *Ayurvedic Management of Acne in Immunocompromised Patient – A Case Study*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study presents a clinically relevant and uncommon case with practical importance
- The case history and clinical findings are described in adequate detail
- Treatment protocol is clearly explained with internal and external therapies
- Clinical improvement is supported with before and after photographs
- The discussion links Ayurvedic concepts with disease pathology
- The outcome appears favorable without reported adverse effects
- The study may encourage further research in integrative dermatology

Weakness of the study:

- The report is limited to a single case and lacks generalizability
- No long term follow up has been provided
- Objective laboratory or validated outcome measures are limited
- Several grammatical and typographical errors reduce readability
- The discussion contains repetitive explanations in some sections
- More recent scientific references should be included
- Ethical approval and patient consent should be described more clearly

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents an interesting case of acne management in an immunocompromised patient using Ayurvedic treatment. The topic is clinically relevant because steroid induced acne in patients with multiple comorbidities can be challenging to manage. The case history, treatment protocol, and clinical outcome are described in a logical manner, and the clinical photographs support the reported improvement. However, the manuscript requires careful language editing, as several grammatical, spelling, and formatting errors affect the overall presentation. Ethical aspects should be strengthened by clearly mentioning institutional ethical approval and written informed consent for publication of the case and clinical images. As this is a single case report, the findings cannot be generalized and this limitation should be acknowledged more clearly. Additional recent literature would improve the discussion and scientific value. Overall, the manuscript is informative and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to describe an original clinical case, and no obvious evidence of prior publication or duplicated content was identified during this review. No apparent plagiarism concerns were observed. However, a standard plagiarism similarity check by the journal is recommended before publication to ensure originality and compliance with publication ethics.