|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | |
| Journal Name: | [**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**](https://journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR) |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms\_JAMMR\_134688** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **Microbiology of Dental Calculus of Prehistoric People from Cabeçuda Shell Mound, Santa Catarina, Brazil** |
| Type of the Article | **Original Research Article** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The study will aid the health care force to learn more about the population from 1950s. It will help scientist understand how oral health and diseases have evolved over time. As the author has mentioned, it has surely opened the doors to study the presence of genus Vibro among this population and its possible involvement in various medical conditions. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Yes |  |
| 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. | Abstract is comprehensive. However, I would like to suggest some grammar corrections:  Methods: 1. Calculi extraction & preparation **were** in the laboratory of paleoparasitology at Fiocruz,  Results: No *Vibrio* was detected, but 5 different morphotypes were described and associated **with** possible gend |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | It looks correct, it will surely add novel findings to the literature. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | It requires grammar correction, but otherwise, it is scientifically very well written. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Manuscript looks good and can be accepted after revision to grammar errors. I would highly recommend using any grammar tool to check and fix errors. |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the 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 detail)*  Not that I noticed |  |

**Reviewer details:**

**Sapna Pardasani, St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, United States**