

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52502

Date: 26/06/2025

Title: Comparative Efficacy and Safety of Topical and Oral Antifungal Agents in the Treatment of Tinea Capitis

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

Date: 26/06/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication:

The paper offers a valuable, wide-ranging overview of the current landscape of tinea capitis management, emphasizing the importance of tailored therapies considering efficacy, safety, resistance, and social factors. It underscores the need for continued research into novel treatments, improved diagnostics, and public health strategies to prevent and control ringworm infections effectively. However, future updates should incorporate quantitative data, detailed resistance profiles, and economic analyses to strengthen its clinical utility.

Reviewer's Comment / Report

Strengths:

- Comprehensive Overview:** The paper provides an extensive review of the etiology, types, and epidemiology of tinea capitis, emphasizing risk factors such as hygiene, environment, and immune status.
- Comparison of Treatments:** It systematically compares topical versus oral antifungal therapies, discussing efficacy, safety, and challenges like drug resistance, which is pertinent for clinical decision-making.
- Inclusion of Recent Advances:** The discussion encompasses emerging treatment modalities such as laser therapy, AI diagnostic tools, and natural products, indicating a forward-looking perspective.
- Public Health and Prevention Focus:** The paper highlights the importance of hygiene, education, and socioeconomic factors in controlling the spread of ringworm, especially in vulnerable populations.
- Multidisciplinary Approach:** It links clinical treatment with psychological and social considerations, supporting a holistic management approach [T10].

Weaknesses:

- Lack of Quantitative Data:** The review does not specify detailed statistical comparisons or meta-analyses to quantify the efficacy and safety differences between treatments, limiting the strength of evidence.
- Limited Discussion on Specific Drug Resistance Data:** Though resistance is mentioned as a concern, the paper lacks in-depth analysis of resistance patterns and their impact on treatment choice.
- Potential Bias in Sources:** Predominance of certain references (e.g., [T10]) may suggest reliance on specific studies, potentially affecting comprehensive objectivity.
- Insufficient Emphasis on Cost-Effectiveness:** Economic considerations of treatment options are not thoroughly analyzed, which is vital in resource-limited settings.
- Absence of Standardized Treatment Guidelines:** While treatment options are discussed, the paper could improve by providing clear, consensus-based guidelines or algorithms.