



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_47014
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison and Evaluation of Seven Animal Ischemic Skin Wound Models
Type of the Article	Review Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Tissue ischemia is an important complicating factor both for wound development and for healing. Therefore, the evaluation and comparison of ischemia in cutaneous models of animals brings relevant information to the understanding of these mechanisms, which shows the relevance to the present manuscript.</p> <p>Title I suggest that you add to the title that it is a systematic review.</p> <p>Introduction Pg 129 - Cite the reference of the figure shown. At the end of the introduction the research question should be based on the acronym PICOS.</p> <p>Methods -Indicate whether there is a review and registration protocol for the systematic review and where it can be accessed. -Describe all sources of information in the search (eg database with dates of coverage, contact with authors to identify additional studies) and date of last search. - Present the complete electronic search strategy for at least one database, including the limits used, so that it can be repeated. - Present the process of selection of the studies (that is, search, eligibility, those included in the systematic review). -Describe the method of extracting data from the articles (eg forms for pilot, independent, in duplicate) and all processes for obtaining and confirming the data of the researchers. -Describe the methods used to assess the risk of bias in each study.</p> <p>Results - Present study numbers tracked, assessed for eligibility and included in the review, rationale for exclusion at each stage, preferably by means of flow chart. - Present bias risk assessment results across studies.</p> <p>Discussion -Sumarize key findings, including the strength of evidence for each outcome; consider its relevance to key groups (eg health professionals, users, and policy makers). -Discuss limitations at the level of studies and outcomes (eg risk of bias) and at the level of review (eg incomplete collection of identified research, reporting bias).</p> <p>Conclusion - Present the general interpretation of results in the context of other evidence and implications for future research.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The PRISMA recommendation consists of a checklist with 27 items and available online for use by researchers and a four-step flowchart. The purpose of PRISMA is to help authors improve the reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyzes. http://www.prisma-statement.org/</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>I suggest performing review of the spelling and grammar of the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	
--	--	--

Reviewer Details:

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