

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Biochemistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRB_130338
Title of the Manuscript:	INTERLEUKIN-6 AND MYELOPEROXIDASE MODULATING POTENTIALS OF CORTICOSTEROID -MUPIROCIN CREAM ON INFECTED WOUNDS IN MALE WISTAR RATS.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	<p>1. The manuscript offers insights into optimizing treatment strategies for wound infections by examining corticosteroid-mupirocin combinations, addressing a significant clinical challenge.</p> <p>2. It identifies myeloperoxidase as a more reliable biomarker for monitoring wound infection resolution compared to interleukin-6, which could enhance diagnostic approaches.</p> <p>3. The research underscores the importance of understanding cytokine dynamics in wound healing, potentially guiding future studies and clinical practices in this field.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>TITLE CAN BE MODIFIED A BIT AS WRITTEN IN THE FEEDBACK</p> <p>EFFECTS OF CORTICOSTEROID -MUPIROCIN CREAM ON INTERLEUKIN 6 AND MYELOPEROXIDASE LEVELS IN INFECTED WOUNDS OF MALE WISTAR RATS</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>The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from:</p> <p>1. Clarifying Objectives: State the hypothesis or expected outcomes for the corticosteroid-mupirocin combinations.</p> <p>2. Details on Methodology: Include brief information on how interleukin-6 and myeloperoxidase were measured.</p> <p>3. Key Findings: Emphasize the implications of the insignificant changes observed.</p> <p>These additions can enhance clarity without overwhelming the reader.</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES THE ARTICLE IS SCIENTIFICALLY CORRECT	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES REFERENCES ARE SUFFICIENT AND RECENT	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language and English quality of the abstract are generally suitable for scholarly communication. Minor improvements could enhance clarity, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Precision: Use clearer phrases, e.g., "showed no significant decrease" instead of "insignificantly decreased."2. Conciseness: Tighten sentences to eliminate redundancy. <p>Overall the abstract is appropriate but could benefit from these minor refinements</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript presents valuable insights into the effects of corticosteroid mupirocin combinations on wound infection management. However, the authors should clarify their methodology and emphasize the significance of their findings to enhance the overall impact of the study.</p> <p>No competing interest issues in this 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mallam Meghanaa
Department, University & Country	Apollo Hospitals, India