

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_89760
Title of the Manuscript:	Digital Microscopy Using Online Mapping Technology: A Solution for Oral Pathology Education in Virtual Learning
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript consists of total 14 pages, including 2 figures and the list of total 29 literature references. The article presents the original results of a study aiming at creation of an e-learning tool applying the digital microscopy in the field of oral pathology. As such, the article fits into the scope of the works published in the journal and presents as an interesting and novel material to the Journal's Readers. The structure of the manuscript is clear and logical, the language quality is acceptable. The title of the manuscript is adequate to the contents of the main text. The main question is, why the Authors have waited 5 years with publishing the results of their study? It means ages in the field of modern technologies and once was a cutting edge solution in its time now became a wide variety of ripe and commercially available products.</p> <p>The Abstract mirrors the structure and the crucial contents of the main text adequately.</p> <p>The Introduction section provides enough background information on the explored problem but it would be valuable to mention competitive solutions currently available on the market - both free educational resources databases and the commercial solutions for tele-pathology, designed for clinical and university purposes.</p> <p>The Methods are described in enough detail.</p> <p>The Results are consistent with the methods described and clearly presented.</p> <p>The Discussion section misses, exactly as the Introduction, comparison of the Authors' solution with those currently available on the market.</p> <p>The Conclusions are relevant to the discussed results.</p> <p>The literature references are numerous and relevant to the topic raised in the manuscript but the majority of them are more than 5 years old so the Authors may consider looking for newer information sources to update the article's with the state of the art knowledge.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comment		

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:	Robert Suslo
Department, University & Country	Wroclaw Medical University, Poland