

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2472
Title of the Manuscript:	Epigallocatechin gallate prevents burn wound progression through inhibiting mitochondrial DNA-induced inflammation
Type of the Article	Book chapter

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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study aimed to investigate the effect of epigallocatechin gallate on experimental burn wound progression.Epigallocatechin gallate treatment significantly reduced mitochondrial DNA levels in serum and inflammatory response in burn wounds. The manuscript has scientific significance in the development of novel formulation using epigallocatechin gallate	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Mitochondrial DNA-induced inflammation response of Epigallocatechin gallate for burn wound.	
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 must include the background of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	For Research Articles, the manuscript should begin with the title page and abstract followed by the main text, which must be structured into separate sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion and Consent to Participate, Human and Animal Rights, Consent for Publication, Availability of Data and Materials, Funding, Conflict of Interest, Acknowledgements and References.	
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 minimumof3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Please use an arrow to show the lesion in your histology analysis. Please cite recent research on burn wound studies to compare or justify your findings with other researchers.The discussion is too long. Please answer your discussion by looking at your objective (you may refer to how other researchers have written their discussions). The authors have not mentioned the conclusion of their study. There are many grammatical errors and several sentences with an ambiguous meaning. Please check carefully.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It looks like the manuscript has too many older references. Authors should avoid citing too many old references when conducting original research.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Readability suggestions cover issues like conciseness, redundancy, transition, and flow and suggest improved phrasing. Mechanics and style cover issues like capitalization, hyphenation, punctuation, spacing, etc.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pranay Wal
Department, University & Country	Pranveer Singh Institute of Technology, India