

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_128032
Title of the Manuscript:	DERMAL SUBSTITUTE IN THE WOUND MANAGEMENT: OUR INSTITUTIONAL EXPERIENCE
Type of the Article	clinical research study

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important because it studies two dermal substitutes, Matriderm and BTM, used for wound healing. It provides basic information about their effectiveness, cost, and scar quality. However, the study is too small and does not give strong evidence to help the scientific community fully trust the results. For it to be truly valuable, the authors must fix the problems, such as including more patients and explaining their methods clearly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not entirely suitable. It is overly broad and does not convey the specific focus or scope of the study. A more appropriate title would highlight the comparison between Matriderm and BTM: "Comparative Analysis of Matriderm and Biodegradable Temporizing Matrix in Full-Thickness Burn and Post-Traumatic Wound Management: A Single-Institution Study."	
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.	The abstract of the article provides a general overview but lacks critical details necessary for clarity and comprehensiveness. While it outlines the methods, results, and conclusions, it fails to specify the techniques used for wound preparation, measurement of outcomes, or statistical significance of the results. Additionally, the absence of any mention of limitations, such as the small sample size or short follow-up period, undermines the transparency and balance of the study. The discussion of cost-effectiveness is vague, lacking context about why BTM was considered more economical, and the patient demographics are not described, leaving the study population ambiguous. Furthermore, the conclusion is overly broad, missing practical implications for clinicians.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is not entirely scientifically correct, as it suffers from significant methodological, analytical, and reporting flaws that undermine its validity. The small sample size of 14 patients lacks statistical power and generalizability, compounded by the absence of randomization, raising concerns about selection bias and comparability. Outcome measures such as "integration with host tissue" and "scar quality" are vague and lack descriptions of validated assessment tools, making the findings subjective and difficult to reproduce. Confounding factors, such as patient comorbidities and infection control practices, are not accounted for, leaving the results open to alternative explanations. Statistical analysis is inadequate, with no mention of significance testing or confidence intervals, weakening the credibility of the conclusions. Additionally, the discussion is overly confident, failing to acknowledge key limitations, including the short follow-up period and lack of demographic diversity, while the cost-effectiveness analysis is oversimplified without proper economic evaluation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are insufficient and outdated, with the most recent citation from 2012, failing to reflect recent advancements in wound management. Incorporating newer studies would significantly enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance. For example, a 2024 systematic review by Grande et al. evaluated the use of Biodegradable Temporizing Matrix (BTM) in complex wound reconstruction across 202 patients, emphasizing its versatility and low infection rates. Similarly, a 2023 case series by Parker et al. highlighted successful integration and aesthetic outcomes using NovoSorb™ BTM, and a study by Cereceda-Monteoliva et al. in the same year demonstrated BTM's effectiveness in preparing vascularized tissue beds for skin grafting. Including these recent findings would provide a more comprehensive and up-to-date context, aligning the manuscript with current practices and knowledge in the field.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article falls below the standard required for scholarly communication, with frequent issues of verbosity, lack of precision, and inconsistent terminology that hinder readability and professionalism. Key terms like "integration with host tissue" and "scar quality" are vague and undefined, while overly broad statements, such as "Matriderm provides superior scar quality," lack scientific rigor and justification. Additionally, informal phrases and occasional grammatical errors further detract from the manuscript's clarity and academic tone.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcos Leal Brioschi
Department, University & Country	Sao Paulo University, Brazil