

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_95130
Title of the Manuscript:	The Annealing Effects on the Modulus of Elasticity Properties of Different Varieties of Orthodontic Wires – In Vitro Study
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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, this topic has great importance in orthodontics, as wires are critical component of fixed orthodontic therapy. So discussion on their properties is always necessary for achieving successful results of orthodontic treatment.</p> <p>2. Article title is suitable</p> <p>3. Abstract Results and conclusion are not clearly explained and can be written in better way to make the things clear.</p> <p>4. Structured pattern of article is correct.</p> <p>5. Scientifically article is right, good topic.</p> <p>6. Recent references were added.</p> <p>7. Materials and methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperature of flame was not mentioned • How the each wire was held at same distance during heating process • Method for equal time of heating for each sample • During heating one side of wire, how the other unannealed side of wire was protected • Calculation of sample size • Why the distance markings were done on annealed side of wire. <p>8. Results: Results should be written in better way, Things are not so clear</p> <p>9. Discussion: Some studies quoted in discussion but their conclusion was not written. Studies were not co related to the study done. Discussion can be better elaborated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Article need revision in text of results and discussion	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Topic of article is very good,	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukhpal Kaur
Department, University & Country	Desh Bhagat Dental College & Hospital, India