

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_103580</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Techniques for the safety use of high-frequency ultrasound-guided for facial procedures: A Technical Note</b>
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> )

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, definitely this is such a current phenomena to be discussed.</p> <p>Title artical is justify the whole description of manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract is not comprehensive and not wirren in universal manner of the abstract body.</p> <p>All the sections and sub sections are well written and classified there own heierarchy.</p> <p>Yes the aspect of the manuscript which the author tells about the scientific community and the society too is relevent and correct in madicinally manner too.</p> <p>References are enough to justify all the data and facts are work pioneer describe and arranged well likely appendix.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Overall whole manuscript is very informative but the abstract i would say have to be consider for revision.	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shirin Quazi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sangam University, India</b>