

October 24, 2015

Dear Editor,

**Title:** Psoriasis treatment: unconventional and non-standard modalities in the era of biologics

**Author:** Vikram K Mahajan

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Dermatology*

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 22162

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers: Please find Reviewers' comments and Author's reply to them on next pages.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Dermatology.

Sincerely yours,



Vikram K Mahajan,  
Department of Dermatology, Venereology & Leprosy,  
Dr. R. P. Govt. Medical College,  
Kangra (Tanda)- 176001, Himachal Pradesh  
India

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22162

**Title:** Psoriasis treatment: unconventional and non-standard modalities in the era of biologics

**Reviewer's code:** 01016438

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 14:24

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-23 16:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very well written and comprehensive review on unconventional psoriasis therapies. The author observed that treatment of psoriasis often lasts throughout life and that the first line therapeutic approach (including biological new drugs) cannot be tolerated for a long period of time. Therefore he focused on several possible therapeutic alternatives, which he calls "unconventional", concerning both changes in lifestyle and drugs. These unconventional treatments are less used and, according to the author, can be used by psoriasis patients with mild lesions, and /or intolerant to conventional drugs and / or in patients who have developed severe side effects. The manuscript further aims at dissecting the benefits and disadvantages of each treatment suggested by the author. Although this topic has been studied and treated by a significant portion of the scientific world, in this review, authors reviewing the literature of the studies that have dealt with this problem, provide to the scientific community a systematic discussion on all it is known on this issue, and in the main time emphasized the need for more clinical observations.

**Reply:** Thanks for elaborate comments. Hope you find revised version of equal quality.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22162

**Title:** Psoriasis treatment: unconventional and non-standard modalities in the era of biologics

**Reviewer's code:** 00646517

**Reviewer's country:** Mexico

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 14:24

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-25 22:21

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would suggest to the author include one reference about adverse effects of retinoids, these could be different in each case (acitretin and isotretinoin).

**Reply:** Thanks. All adverse effects listed in the manuscript are referred in standard textbooks. Please find reference no. 182 and 183 for other uncommon ones

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22162

**Title:** Psoriasis treatment: unconventional and non-standard modalities in the era of biologics

**Reviewer's code:** 00646486

**Reviewer's country:** Hungary

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 14:24

**Date reviewed:** 2015-09-27 19:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very detailed review manuscript. I have the following comments and suggestions. The review has to be much shorter actually the current manuscript looks like a book chapter and not a review manuscript. The whole review should not be longer than 10-15 pages in pdf final form. Much less References are needed, only the most important ones not more than 100-150 references. The author also discusses conventional therapies such as methotrexate, acitretin, topical vitamin D analogs, phototherapy, fumaric esters, calcineurin inhibitors, climatherapy, balneotherapy, apremilast, etc. All of them are conventional therapies. If the author writes about unconventional and non-standard treatment modalities in the era of biologics then the standard treatment options should only be mentioned very shortly in introduction, a table which summarizes standard and conventional treatments and another table summarizing non conventional treatments should be used. It is not necessary to use tables which refer to methotrexate. This is a very standard and conventional treatment.

**Reply:** Thanks. The text on conventional therapies is deleted. They are now only find brief mention in the "introduction" or "comments" sections as suggested. However, the tables referring methotrexate adverse effects, drug interactions or follow up, etc may be retained for making the manuscript more comprehensive.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Dermatology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 22162

**Title:** Psoriasis treatment: unconventional and non-standard modalities in the era of biologics

**Reviewer's code:** 02462242

**Reviewer's country:** Brazil

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-19 14:24

**Date reviewed:** 2015-10-01 17:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author submits a review regarding unconventional and non-standard therapeutic modalities for psoriasis in the era of biologics. A peer-reviewed article should cut to the chase. Only unconventional treatments should be explored in the article. All conventional treatments (e.g., methotrexate and vitamin D analogs) should be excluded. A systematic review with a well-established method could improve the study. The inclusion of grades of recommendation and level of evidence for the studies included also improve the present manuscript. What studies were used? The inclusion of these studies followed which criteria? It would be interesting if the authors could return to its database to include such information. How many articles were identified for review, how many were rejected for the title, how many abstracts were reviewed and how many papers ultimately ended up in the review? In a systematic review, the results and discussion should be separate. A table summarizing the main findings would also be interesting.

**Reply: Thanks. The text on conventional therapies is deleted. They are only mentioned briefly in the introduction or comments sections. I may submit that this paper is not intended to be a "Systematic Review".**

