

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_96956
Title of the Manuscript:	YouTube as an Auxiliary Source of Learning Clinical Skills for Dental Students in Qassim Dental College in Saudi Arabia.
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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. 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>	Yes, because most young people use YouTube <b>YES</b> Yes  No , article needs to have abstract, introduction , method and material, result and conclusion, on method part you don't need so many tittle, please removed all those titles and just put method and material.  Result has too many tables you don't need that many tables 4 tables will be adequate. You don't need recommendation you can put that, as part of you conclusion and future recommendation.  Ethical approval needs to be part of method. It needs to put at the beginning of method.  Some references are more than ten years, please remove any reference that is more than ten years.	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Please rewrite the paper follow my recommendation.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pouran Famili
Department, University & Country	University of Pittsburgh, USA