

Reviewer comments:

In this study, the authors performed a comprehensive systematic meta-analysis to evaluate the efficacy of gold nanoparticles (GNPs) in promoting wound healing in animal models. A total of 31 randomized controlled trials were included, and the pooled effect size (Cohen's $d = 4.52$) indicated a significant enhancement in wound closure associated with GNP administration, despite the presence of moderate to high heterogeneity. The risk of bias was systematically assessed using both the Cochrane and CAMARADES tools, ensuring methodological rigor. This study contributes meaningful evidence supporting the therapeutic promise of GNPs in regenerative medicine. Nevertheless, several critical issues remain to be addressed—particularly in the organization of the introduction, clarity in data presentation, consistency in formatting, and the integration of recent literature. Addressing these concerns will significantly enhance the scientific robustness and practical relevance of the manuscript.

1. Keywords:

It is recommended that the keywords be revised and further refined to better capture the central themes, methodologies, and innovations presented in the study. A more targeted and specific selection of keywords will enhance the discoverability and clarity of the manuscript in relevant academic databases.

2. Introduction:

The Introduction lacks coherence and logical flow between paragraphs. For instance, the first paragraph does not clearly outline the advantages and challenges of using biopharmaceuticals in wound healing. Yet, the second paragraph abruptly shifts focus to the relationship between nanoparticles and drug delivery without establishing a clear connection to wound healing or gold

nanoparticles (GNPs). The authors are advised to revise this section to improve logical transitions between sentences and paragraphs, and to establish a more cohesive narrative that contextualizes the study's relevance.

3. Materials and Methods:

The alignment between subheadings and their corresponding content needs to be standardized throughout the section. For example, formatting inconsistencies can be seen around line 121, where a sentence is missing a period. The authors are encouraged to carefully proofread the entire manuscript for uniform formatting and punctuation.

4. Figures:

All figures should be revised for optimal resolution, appropriate sizing, and consistent formatting. Particular attention should be paid to the figure legends—for example, Figure 1—where punctuation errors are noted. Please ensure that all figure captions are clearly written, correctly punctuated, and aligned with journal standards.

5. Tables:

The dimensions and layout of all tables should be adjusted to align with the manuscript's formatting requirements. This includes ensuring that column widths, text alignment, and overall visual presentation are consistent and clear.

6. References:

The reference list should be updated to include the most recent and relevant literature, particularly to support key arguments in the main text. For example, references such as 19 and 72 should be carefully reviewed and updated if more recent data are available. A broader inclusion of current studies will help

strengthen the manuscript's academic credibility.