

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_90426
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral Mucositis and Salivary Nitric Oxide Levels in Patients on Radiotherapy for Head and Neck Tumors
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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>Authors analyzed and evaluated the role of NO on Oral Mucositis during the Radiotherapy for head and neck tumors patients. They found that mucositis degrees was significant positive correlated with pain intensities, but the NO levels were correlated neither with mucositis nor with pain intensity throughout the experimental weeks. The data showed here are interesting. But,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Firstly, the English writing is poor, there are many mistakes in the manuscript, especially grammatical mistakes, authors need to edit this manuscript extensively to improve the English.</li> <li>2. Authors should give the information for the equipment of irradiation, manufacture, ray(X-ray), and the typical figures of target volume delineation and dose distributions, as well as the typical figures of Oral Mucositis.</li> <li>3. Theoretically, Oral Mucositis degrees are related to the radiotherapy equipment and dose, and the results are not reliable due to the small sample size, authors should expand the sample size and perform further study.</li> <li>4. All of the tables should be three-line tables.</li> <li>5. References were not latest, especially about the newly 3 years.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There are some grammatical and spelling mistakes Results and discussion section, the second paragraph, buccal mucosa (n = 3), and buccal mucosa (n = 2), which one is correct?</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All of the tables should be three-line tables.</li> <li>2. References were not latest, especially about the newly 3 years.</li> </ol>	

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Xiaojing Chang
Department, University & Country	The Second Hospital of Hebei Medical University, China