

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123978
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Role of Nasoalveolar Moulding in Pre-Surgical Intervention for Bilateral Cleft Lip and Palate
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Does the manuscript include all the information it should? Is all the information accurate? Is the content consistent throughout? Is Are grammar, spelling, punctuation, and word use correct throughout? everything clearly worded? Does the manuscript comply with the instructions?</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>In preparing a title for a paper, you would do well to remember one salient fact: This title will be read by thousands of people. Perhaps few people, if any, will read the entire paper, but many people will read the title, either in the original journal, in one of the secondary (abstracting and indexing) databases, in a search engine's output, or otherwise. <i>What is a good title? We define it as the fewest possible words that adequately describe the contents of the paper</i></p> <p>An introduction that is structured in this way (see, for example, Figure 10.1) has a "funnel" shape, moving from broad and general to narrow and specific. Such an introduction can comfortably funnel readers into reading about the details of your research.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>An abstract should be viewed as a miniature version of the paper. The abstract should provide a <i>brief</i> summary of each of the main sections of the paper: introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. The abstract should (1) state the principal objectives and scope of the investigation, (2) describe the methods employed, (3) summarize the results, and (4) state the principal conclusions. The importance of the conclusions is indicated by the fact that they are often given three times: once in the abstract, again in the introduction, and again (in more detail, probably) in the discussion.</p> <p>In addition to abstracts, other components briefly conveying key points to readers, skimmers, or browsers. The abstract should never give any information or conclusion that is not stated in the paper. Literature must not be cited in the abstract (except in rare instances, such as modification of a previously published method).</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The first section of the text proper should, of course, be the introduction. The purpose of the introduction is to supply sufficient background information to allow the reader to understand and evaluate the results of the present stud without needing to refer to previous publications on the topic.</p> <p>Today, most scientific journals print an abstract before the main text of each paper. Because the abstract precedes the paper itself, and because the editors and reviewers like a bit of orientation, the abstract is almost always the first part of the manuscript read during the review process.</p>	
<p>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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>In describing the methods of the investigations, you should give (or direct readers to) sufficient details so that a competent worker could repeat the experiments. If your method is new (unpublished), you must provide <i>all</i> of the needed detail.</p> <p>For methods the usual order of presentation is chronological. Obviously, however, related methods should be described together, and straight chronological order cannot always be followed.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The discussion (which some journals term a comment, especially for short papers) is harder to define than the other sections. Thus, it is usually the hardest section to write. And, whether you know it or not, <i>many</i> papers are rejected by journal editors because of a faulty discussion, even though the data of the</p>	

Review Form 3

:	<p>paper might be both valid and interesting.</p> <p>Most importantly, in the manuscript you should present representative data rather than endlessly repetitive data. The fact that you could perform the same experiment 100 times without significant divergence in results might be of considerable interest to your major professor, but editors, not to mention readers, prefer a little bit of predigestion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Of course, you still must use the English language if you want your work to have greatest visibility. For some, this may be difficult. If your native language is not English, you may face particular challenges in English-language writing .</p> <p>You will thereby avoid most serious grammatical problems and make it easier for people whose native language is not English.</p> <p>First, list only significant published references. References to unpublished data, abstracts, theses, and other secondary materials should not clutter up the references or literature-cited section.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The citation order system is simply a system of citing the references (by number) in the order in which they appear in the paper. This system avoids the substantial printing expense of the name and year system, and readers often like it because they can quickly refer to the references, if they so desire, in one-two- three order as they come to them in the text. It is a useful system for a journal that is basically a "note" journal, each paper containing only a few references.</p> <p>Second, ensure that all parts of everyreference are accurate. Doing so may entail checking every reference against the original publication before the manuscript is submitted and perhaps again at the proof stage.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu-Hussein Muhamad
Department, University & Country	University of Athens, Greece