

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_96472</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Tuberculous osteomyelitis of mandible in a young child– A diagnostic dilemma</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

### 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 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes. The manuscript presented a case on Tuberculous OM of the mandible in a pediatric patient which is rare. The diagnostic quandary was highlighted with picture of the patient shown and imaging attached, along with the description of the case. If author would emphasize on how they come to the diagnosis and the rationale behind the differential diagnostic process, the discussion would be better and more interesting. Besides, due to the nature of the case report which focuses on the "diagnostic" part. Only a very minor discussion was made by the author on the treatment part. It would also be interesting to the readers to know about the treatment options if they encounter similar case in the future.</b> 2. <b>The title is suitable</b> 3. <b>Yes.</b> 4. <b>Yes.</b> 5. <b>Yes.</b> 6. <b>Most of the references are up-to-date and reflect the author is writing the manuscript with an evidence-based manners. However, the formats of the references were not standardized.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, however, manuscript should be submitted to professional language editor for proofreading and editing to improve on the grammars and flow of the article.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Not applicable	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lim Ming Chiang</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hospital Sultan Haji Ahmad Shah, Malaysia</b>