



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_26367
Title of the Manuscript:	Duct Tape with Adhesive Cyanoacrylate Versus Cryotherapy in the Treatment of Warts
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Although the manuscript is overall interesting, there are several issues that the authors need to address.</p> <p>1.- The introduction would benefit from a brief review of the literature of previous studies that show the efficacy and safety of Duct tape (Focht, 2002). It will also help to add some of the theories about its mechanism of action, or at least suggest how does it work.</p> <p>2.- The authors describe what is and the uses of cyanoacrylate in medicine, but they failed to mention which is the objective of adding this product to Duct tape. Do they want to hence the adhesion of the duct tape to the skin or increase the occlusion/and or maceration of the wart? Is there any other study showing the efficacy of this combination for the management of viral warts? Please specify.</p> <p>3.-In the methods, the authors report that they enrolled 62 patients, how did they calculate the sample, based on what assumptions? The authors need to clarify the study design. (randomized trial vs comparative cohort) I suggest that the authors include a flow chart describing the patient selection.</p> <p>4.-The manuscript has several grammar mistakes. I suggest a review by a native English speaker.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Blanca Rosa Del Pozzo-Magana
Department, University & Country	Pediatrics, Wester University, London, ontario Canada