

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_92411
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE PROS AND CONS OF DEFINITIONS OF RADIATION-INDUCED TRISMUS
Type of the Article	Review 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	IN THE ABSTRACT WE NEED TO GIVE AN OVERVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT. INTRODUCE, DESCRIBE THE METHODOLOGY AND FINAL CONSIDERATIONS. THE READER MUST BE INVOLVED BY THE ABSTRACT TO READ THE MANUSCRIPT. KEYWORDS MUST BE SEARCHED ON THE DESCRIPTORS SITE: https://decs.bvsalud.org/ THE KEYWORDS USED WERE NOT FOUND ON THE SITE THERE'S NO DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE RESEARCH. HOW MANY REFERENCES WERE USED? WHAT TIME LAPSE WAS USED? USUALLY, A LITERATURE REVIEW HAS NO RESULTS. BUT, AS THE WORK PROPOSES A SEARCH ON PROS AND CONS, THE TABLE SHOULD BE INCLUDED AS A RESULT AND THE FINAL CONSIDERATIONS MUST TAKE THIS RESULT INTO CONSIDERATION.	
Minor REVISION comments	ABBREVIATIONS SUCH AS "Radiation therapy (RT)" MUST APPEAR IN THE INTRODUCTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT. IN THE ABSTRACT MUST BE IN FULL DESCRIPTION	
Optional/General comments	THE QUANTITY OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCE IS SATISFACTORY, THE INTRODUCTION WELL DIVIDED AND THE DISCUSSION WELL ORGANIZED	

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:	Eduardo Martinez Martinez
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Bahia, Brazil