

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJDS_95130</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Annealing Effects on the Modulus of Elasticity Properties of Different Varieties of Orthodontic Wires – In Vitro Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes, it is. This study describes the effect of annealing on the modulus of elasticity of different types of orthodontic wires.</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> No, it's not. The subsection of the results is wrong; the text exceeds the number of words; exceeds the number of figures/tables; the abstract exceeds the number of words; o item 4 "swot analysis" is unnecessary.</p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> Yes, it is.</p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> Yes, it is.</p> <p><b>Below are my comments regarding the manuscript:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 1 is unnecessary.</li> <li>• Figure 1. Using only one image to illustrate the demarcated areas.</li> <li>• Figure 2 and 3 are unnecessary.</li> <li>• Merge tables 2 and 3. Merge Mean and SD in the same column.</li> <li>• Merge figures 4 and 5.</li> <li>• Table 4 and 5. Merge Mean and SD in the same column.</li> <li>• Table 6 is unnecessary.</li> <li>• Table 7. Remove column N. Merge Mean and SD in the same column.</li> <li>• Figures 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 are unnecessary. The information is in table 7.</li> <li>• Tables do not meet the settings for a table. Tables do not feature closed sides and internal lines.</li> <li>• Tables 8, 9 and 10 are unnecessary.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Savio Morato de Lacerda Gontijo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Centro Universitário UNA, Brazil</b>