

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130828
Title of the Manuscript:	DONOR SITE MORBIDITY: COMPARING THE USE OF COBBETT KNIFE WITH ZIMMER ELECTRIC POWER DERMATOME IN HARVESTING PARTIAL THICKNESS SKIN GRAFT
Type of the Article	

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.	By analyzing re-epithelialization rates, pain levels, and scar formation, this study offers evidence-based guidance for surgeons in selecting the most suitable method, particularly in resource-limited settings where access to advanced equipment may be restricted. The findings highlight the potential benefits of the Zimmer electric dermatome in reducing early post-operative pain while demonstrating comparable healing outcomes with the Cobbett knife.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	May consider this title:- Donor Site Morbidity in Skin Grafting: A Comparative Study of Cobbett Knife and Zimmer Electric Dermatome	
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 is generally comprehensive but could benefit from minor refinements for clarity, conciseness, and additional methodological details.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There is one repetition , authors need to recheck	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need professional editing	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mohammed F Khurram
Department, University & Country	Aligarh Muslim University, India