



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_68115
Title of the Manuscript:	CONDUCTING DERMATOLOGICAL OPERATIONS IN PATIENTS WHO HAVE PREVIOUSLY UNDERGONE CARDIAC SURGERY
Type of the Article	

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Dermatologists should be aware that temporary epicardial pacemaker electrodes and pacemaker electrodes often remain in the chest wall of many patients.” This is simply not true. Although temporary epicardial pacemaker electrodes are almost routinely implanted in open heart surgery, leaving them behind inside the chest wall is indicated only when the removal carries a high risk of bleeding, which is rare. The Authors do not fully explain the acronyms TEPWS and TTPWS before their introduction, this is considered a bad editorial practice. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “In the process of writing the work, an array of literature was studied within the framework of the designated topic, as well as comparative and comparative methods were used.” Comparative is spelled twice. “Although TTPW and (transvenous) permanent pacemaker or permanent pacemaker are very similar in placement” The sentence may be rewritten as “Although TTPW, transvenous permanent pacemakers or permanent pacemakers in general are very similar in placement” “A permanent pacemaker (ICD) consists of three components: a pulse generator, electrodes, and wires (the latter two form the connecting pins).” An ICD is NOT acronym for permanent pacemaker. “Further complicating this problem is the fact that many postoperative patients with retention wire are often unaware of such abandoned material.” It would be better to use the word “retained” instead of “retention”. “It is important to know that TEPWS are usually administered after these operations, and sometimes they are intentionally left and left in the chest wall, where they can be detected during dermatological procedures”. The word “left” is repeated twice. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>“In particular, when a stored pacemaker wire is found during surgery, the presence of the wire is usually not recorded in any available medical records”. This is just bad practice. The patient and his GP should be informed about the presence of any wire left inside the chest, mainly because this fact can become problematic when executing a MRI scan.</p> <p>Overall the paper is well written and interesting, and addresses an issue often overlooked and of increasing importance. It lacks novelty insofar it does not add anything original, but it can be accepted as a short literature review, albeit with some minor revisions.</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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Francesco Bertelli
Department, University & Country	Italy