

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 discusses a very interesting and actual topic. However, a series of important aspects should have been addressed and multiple issues require attention, as detailed below.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</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 should be improved</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, the structure is classic, scientifically correct.</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>INTRODUCTION</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction section should include a more detailed discussion regarding the pathogenesis of pyoderma gangrenosum and a thorough description of the clinical and histopathological features. Therapeutic options and their efficacy should also be discussed. I suggest moving the presentation of the studies that have evaluated the efficacy of HBOT in pyoderma gangrenosum to the discussion section. <p>METHODOLOGY</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology should be improved. I suggest rephrasing of the following sentences: "The inclusion criteria included..." and "Exclusion criteria included..." The authors do not mention the systemic treatment the patients were receiving for pyoderma gangrenosum, which greatly influences the results. The lack of standardization of HBOT is also a major issue. The authors state that "Treatment took place from Monday to Saturday, in monoplace or multiplace chambers, allowing up to seven patients to be present simultaneously, with sessions lasting between 90 and 120 minutes." The outcome should have been evaluated at precise moments. The patients received 20 to 702 sessions, which make the results very difficult to interpret. <p>RESULTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The patients' demographic characteristics and the evolution of pyoderma gangrenosum lesions are only presented in Table 1, but the results section lacks 	

Review Form 3

	<p>consistency and a detailed presentation of the findings.</p> <p>8. Statistical analyses are lacking.</p> <p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>9. The discussion is brief and superficial. Also, it is very biased. The mechanism of action of HBOT in pyoderma gangrenosum should be thoroughly discussed.</p> <p>10. The authors provide no interpretation of results.</p> <p>11. The results of previous studies on the topic are not presented and critically analyzed.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <p>12. The conclusions are not consistent with the data presented.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, references are recent and relevant.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English editing is required.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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:	Liliana G. Popa
Department, University & Country	Elias Emergency University Hospital, University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania