

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_124665
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy in the Treatment of Pyoderma Gangrenous
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript addresses a crucial gap in the literature concerning the treatment of pyoderma gangrenosum (PG), a rare and severe dermatological condition with limited therapeutic options. The exploration of hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT) as a potential adjuvant treatment is relevant to the medical community, particularly in managing cases resistant to conventional therapies. The findings, though based on a small sample, are promising and indicate that HBOT may contribute to wound healing and symptom relief in PG patients. I appreciate the novelty of the approach, though larger studies are needed to solidify the conclusions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable, but a minor revision could make it more precise, such as: "Evaluating the Efficacy of Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy in Treating Pyoderma Gangrenosum: A Retrospective Study."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a good summary of the study but could benefit from a brief mention of key quantitative results, such as the average reduction in lesion size or the percentage of patients showing significant improvement. Additionally, the abstract should acknowledge the study's limitations more explicitly, including the small sample size and the need for further research with more rigorous designs.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections for the introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. Each section logically progresses, and the flow of information is coherent. However, some subsections, particularly the results, could be more detailed, especially in describing patient outcomes quantitatively and comparing them to other studies.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study is scientifically robust, utilizing appropriate methods such as a retrospective design and analyzing the effects of HBOT in a specific clinical context. However, the small sample size (10 patients) and the lack of a control group limit the generalizability of the findings. Despite these limitations, the manuscript presents valid data indicating that HBOT may play a beneficial role in PG management. The wide range of treatment times suggests the chronic and complex nature of the disease, but more discussion on the mechanisms through which HBOT might help PG would strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references appear sufficient and cite relevant recent literature, particularly those related to HBOT and PG. However, more recent publications (within the last two years) could further support the study's findings, especially given the rapid evolution of dermatological treatments. Adding references from large-scale HBOT studies, if available, might enhance the credibility of the treatment claims.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally clear but could benefit from minor grammatical revisions for better readability. There are a few long and complex sentences that could be simplified for improved comprehension. For example, splitting long sentences in the abstract and methods sections could enhance clarity. The manuscript's overall English quality is good and appropriate for scholarly communication, but a proofreading round for fluency would be beneficial.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript contributes to a niche but important area of research. A prospective study with a larger, more diverse patient population and a control group would provide more definitive evidence. Additionally, including patient-reported outcomes (e.g., quality of life, pain reduction) would add depth to the analysis of HBOT's efficacy. The manuscript has potential, but addressing its limitations will increase its impact on the scientific community.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kirolos Eskandar
Department, University & Country	Helwan University, Egypt