

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAMMR_92339 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | 3D printing in medicine; Application in intracranial tumours in Southern Nigeria |
| Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>Tipo de estudio:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> From what can be seen in the manuscript, this study looks like a presentation of a series of three cases, but the design of the manuscript is not consistent with this type of study. In the abstract, the author(s) provide a section named results (which should not be there if it is a case study), but in the body of the document, there is no such section called results. On the other hand, there is no Method section where tables and images are presented. I believe that this aspect should be analysed in depth, as I also think that due to the characteristics of the research it is a presentation of a series of cases. On the other hand, it can be classified as a method article but still does not make clear or define a results section. | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keywords must be in alphabetical order. There are some aspects related to the use of language that the authors should correct, which have been pointed out in the manuscript. If it is a case presentation, the number of words exceeds 250. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In the introduction, the authors provide the main background to their study and clearly define the terms used. However, the authors should further contextualize the background, especially concerning the research's region. There are some aspects related to the use of language that the authors should correct, which have been pointed out in the manuscript. Regarding the quotation numbers, better citation placement should be considered so as not to give the appearance of over-quotation. They should always be placed after the full stop and the comma and before the semicolon and the colon. <p>Aims</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The objective of this research is not entirely clear-cut. According to the elements shown by the author(s) in their research, it appears to be a presentation of a series of three cases. I consider that in this way the objective should be rephrased as follows: This study aims to demonstrate, through the presentation of a series of three cases, that the finding of cross-sectional CT and MRI images can be used to generate specific 3D printed models. I point this out because the authors talk about having carried out a cost analysis that does not appear as an objective of the study, yet it appears in the conclusions. <p>References</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> They should be checked to ensure that they conform to the Vancouver Standards. | |
| Optional/General comments | The research is very interesting and has novelty and relevance, but I believe that the type of study should be defined to produce a better report. If the aspects mentioned above are solved, I think it should be published. | |

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Orlando Téllez Almenares |
| Department, University & Country | University of Medical Sciences of Santiago de Cuba, Cuba |