

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)
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.	This article is well written.	
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.	No the abstract seems to be sufficient.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	This article doesn't have any statistical testing to make it complex so it is a rather simple article. It is easy to understand. However though the scientific information is sound and correct, the article is not adding anything new to the scientific community. It is only discussing what is already known. Plus te study design is incorrect.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Two of the references are not complete.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments	<p>Comment 1: Kindly paraphrase. Has been copied from an online source</p> <p>Comment 2: Incorrect study design</p> <p>Comment 3: Kindly provide reference.</p> <p>Comment 4: Incomplete methods. Please mention the sampling technique. Also mention the entire methods including the t0 and t1 etc. uploading pictures of the patient would be a plus.</p> <p>Comment 5: Wrong study design. There are 2 groups in cohort study design. Cohort studies are particularly useful for identifying risk factors for diseases.</p> <p>Comment 6: Please write the exclusion criteria.</p> <p>Comment 7: How?</p> <p>Comment 8: No need to mention standard deviations.</p> <p>Comment 9: Copied from an online source. Kindly paraphrase.</p> <p>Comment 10: Write as ± 0.39 instead of writing the word standard deviation.</p> <p>Comment 11: His</p> <p>Comment 12: Kindly mention the title of the article.</p> <p>Comment 13: incomplete</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sundus Shabir
Department, University & Country	Khyber College of Dentistry Peshawar, Pakistan