



**SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1**

**PART 1:**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_47014</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparison and Evaluation of Seven Animal Ischemic Skin Wound Models</b>
New title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparison and Evaluation of Seven Animal Ischemic Skin Wound Models: a systematic review</b>
Type of Article:	<b>Review Paper</b>

**PART 2:**

<b>FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)</b>	<b>Authors' response to final evaluator's comments</b>
<p>The manuscript showed improvement after the changes. However, this study did not fully follow the methodology of the Systematic Review. For example, the study does not have a systematic review protocol registered in PROSPERO or Cochrane, where previously the search should be described, what the inclusion and exclusion criteria will be, how the methodological quality of the studies will be evaluated (which should be Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for cohort and case-control studies, Checklist Downs and Black to evaluate observational and randomized studies among other scales). In this way, we can evaluate the studies included in the review regarding the report, external validity, bias, confounding variable / selection bias and statistical power of the study.</p> <p>The definition of the scale of evaluation is performed from a previous search of the studies in databases before the registration of the protocol. In addition, the search in the databases is based on the research question that must be based on the acronym PICOS. The previous search is also important because it shows if there are similar searches with similar statistical analyzes and in this way define if it is possible to perform a meta-analysis and then define in the protocol how it will be performed.</p> <p>A systematic review should also present a flow of article selection, which was added after my evaluation of the manuscript and follow the PRISMA Checklist (key items to report systematic reviews and meta-analyzes) to bring clarity to the report.</p> <p>Therefore, this study is a review study and it is not a systematic review. I suggest that you remove the term systematic review of the title and of every manuscript and replace it with the word review or review study.</p> <p>1. pg 130 – Put on the figure that was drawn by the authors, this prevents the copy of other researchers without mentioning your study.</p> <p>Methods 1 - Pg 224 = I suggest to remove the mentioned exclusion criteria (exclusion criteria are not the opposite of inclusion criteria). For example, they may mention as exclusion criterion: studies on ischemia involving human beings; study protocols, book chapters, supplements, or editor comments.</p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Miriam Viviane Baron</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul(PUCRS), Brazil</b>