

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16166

**Title:** Stress and quality of life in dermatological patients: Are out-patients' needs different?

**Reviewer's code:** 00646467

**Reviewer's country:** Canada

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-01 20:56

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-14 12:43

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript. My only comment is to add references for the DLQI and CDLQI questionnaires.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16166

**Title:** Stress and quality of life in dermatological patients: Are out-patients' needs different?

**Reviewer's code:** 00646569

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2015-01-01 20:56

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-12 23:59

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It was a very interesting article. It describes another point of vision that we usually neglect in the routine daily dermatology practice. Thanks.