

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-59281

Title: Epidemiological, Clinical, and Etiological Profile of Hypereosinophilia in a Dermatology Department: A Series of 115 Cases.

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:

- Relevant dermatology topic
- Reasonable sample of 115 cases
- Five year retrospective study
- Different causes of eosinophilia are described
- Age related patterns are discussed
- Drug reactions are clearly identified
- Eosinophilic dermatoses are separately presented
- Severity of eosinophilia is included
- A useful disease distribution table is provided

Weakness of the study:

- Ethical clearance is not reported
- Sex distribution contains an obvious numerical inconsistency
- Disease category totals do not fully match the sample
- Definition of hypereosinophilia needs clarification
- Diagnostic workup is not described in sufficient detail
- Statistical analysis is largely absent
- Hospitalized patients limit generalization
- Some clinical claims are stronger than the data
- Grammar and formatting need correction

Reviewers Comments:

This study presents a clinically relevant five-year retrospective series of patients with peripheral blood eosinophilia in a dermatology department. The sample of 115 patients and classification into eosinophilic dermatoses and dermatoses associated with eosinophilia provide useful clinical information. However, major clarification is required before publication. There are important numerical inconsistencies in the manuscript. The abstract reports 71 males and 34 females, which totals 105 rather than 115 patients. The listed disease categories also do not clearly account for all 115 cases. These figures should be carefully checked throughout the tables and text. The definition and diagnostic criteria for hypereosinophilia should also be clearly stated. Ethical clearance and confidentiality procedures are not reported and should be clarified for this retrospective study. More details about the diagnostic workup would strengthen the methodology. Several statements regarding disease associations and prognosis require appropriate supporting references. Grammar, spacing, sentence construction and table formatting also need improvement. Overall, the topic is valuable, but substantial revision is required.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

An exact title search did not identify the same publication. However, closely related studies have already reported dermatological eosinophilia, including a 2014 study of 100 patients and a 2022 retrospective analysis of 453 dermatological patients with blood eosinophilia. (researchgate.net]) The authors should clarify the novelty of this 115 case series. A formal similarity check is recommended.