

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53028

Date: 29.07.20125

Title: Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Over Conventional Dressings - A Retrospective Analysis

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality				Poor
Techn.				Poor
Quality				Poor
Clarity				Poor
Significance			Fair	

Reviewer Name: Dr. Divyaparvathy J

Reviewer's Comment

The manuscript has a major lack of clarity and structure. The methodology section clearly has major flaws related to basic research mandates. There is clear contradiction in the exclusion criteria mentioned, questioning the validity of the data collected. The data analysis of the article is incomplete. Poor presentation and lack of contextuality in expressing thoughts.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The manuscript suffers from inconsistent organization and unclear presentation of key points, making it difficult to follow the study's rationale, methodology, and findings.
2. Important details about the study design are missing or inadequately described. For instance, the criteria for defining chronic ulcers, the sampling and data collection methods, and the statistical analyses performed are not clearly presented.
3. The results lack appropriate statistical testing and reporting (e.g., p-values, confidence intervals), limiting the reliability of the conclusions drawn regarding differences between NPWT and conventional dressings.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. There are contradictory statements regarding patient inclusion criteria (e.g., exclusion of PVD patients requiring amputation vs. presence of PVD ulcers in the sample) that raise concerns about sample selection and data validity.
5. Details on ethical approval, patient consent, and potential biases or confounding factors are absent.