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Title : Dermatosis neglecta in a case of multiple fractures, shoulder dislocation and radial nerve palsy

To
The Editorial Team,
JMCRR

Dear Sirs,

Iam enclosing the revised manuscript corrected in view of the reviewer’s comments along with point by point response to the same in the covering letter.

Regards,
Dr. Qadir

REVIEWER’S COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS

REVIEWER 1:

1. Has the case been reported coherently? Yes

2. Is the case report authentic? Yes

3. Is the case worth reporting? No
   The objective of reporting this case was to make physicians of various disciplines treating patients with physical or mental disabilities, with this simple and easily treated condition so that unnecessary alarm, undue referrals or exhaustive diagnostic and therapeutic endeavours are avoided.
   The same has now been added at the end of discussion and in conclusion.

4. Is the case report persuasive? Yes

5. Does the case report have explanatory value? Yes

6. Does the case report have diagnostic value? No
   Dermatologists come across such patients usually when referred from physicians of other disciplines and it may not be a diagnostic problem for the dermatologists; however, the aim of reporting this case was to familiarize the physicians who are
primarily treating these disabled patients for whom Dermatosis neglecta may be a diagnostic problem. This point has been now highlighted in “Discussion”.

7. Will the case report make a difference to the clinical practice? Yes

8. Is the anonymity of the case protected? Yes

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

The manuscript is well written and the case is interesting.

We appreciate comments of the reviewer.

REVIEWER 2:

1. Has the case been reported coherently? Yes

2. Is the case report authentic? Yes

3. Is the case report ethical? Yes

4. Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication? No

5. Is this case worth reporting? No
   The objective of reporting this case was to make physicians of various disciplines treating patients with physical or mental disabilities, with this simple and easily treated condition so that unnecessary alarm, undue referrals or exhaustive diagnostic and therapeutic endeavours are avoided. The same has now been added at the end of discussion and in conclusion.

6. Is the case report persuasive? Yes

7. Does the case report have explanatory value? No

   Points have been added to the discussion and conclusion to enhance the explanatory value of the case report as mentioned above.

8. Does the case report have diagnostic value? Yes

9. Will the case report make a difference to the clinical practice? No
   Dermatologists come across such patients usually when referred from physicians of other disciplines and it may not be a diagnostic problem for the dermatologists; however, the aim of reporting this case was to familiarize the physicians who are
primarily treating these disabled patients for whom Dermatosis neglecta may be a diagnostic problem. This point has been now highlighted in “Discussion”.

10. Is the anonymity of the case protected? Yes

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

Under the “dermatosis neglecta” the authors report a dermatological noncase associated with poor hygiene. This is a situation sometimes occurring in dermatology. This case is of limited value since the diagnosis is quite obvious to the diligent physician.

We agree with the reviewer that the diagnosis is quite obvious to the diligent dermatologist but it may cause problems when being dealt with non-dermatologists. Such patients are primarily treated by doctors other than dermatologists for their disabilities, it is only later that they develop “dermatosis neglecta” and are referred to dermatologist for diagnosis and treatment. We are of the opinion that publication of this case report in this widely read, prestigious journal would enable the medical fraternity to recognize this problem, which is not very widely reported in literature. This would help them in counseling the disabled patients, avoid unnecessary alarm and diagnose and treat this condition at the earliest.