

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_95603
Title of the Manuscript:	THE BEST TIME TO DENTAL IMPLANT PLACEMENT IN PATIENTS WITH HEAD AND NECK CANCERS: AN EVER-GOING DEBATE
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, very interesting</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The tittle is ok 2. The abstract should be re-elaborated, to large, and needs more specifical data. 3. The sections should be fixed as a literature review article. It isn't well done. 4. Scientifically is correct 5. The references are sufficient but not recent <p>All the suggestions appear in the article, for better comprehension by the authors</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I think this is a very interesting article, needs some corrections but very interesting <i>This article is very interesting and with a controversial topic.</i> <i>I suggest:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>To Review the summary, only data relevant to the controversy. The medical literature search websites used, the literature found, the ones selected and why.....Do not exceed 250 words.</i> • <i>Re-elaborate the objective, the one in the summary does not correspond to the one in the introduction.</i> • <i>As a review article, 3 fundamental parts must be well determined: introduction, development and conclusions. The introduction gives us an overview of why this study is being carried out, providing all the epidemiological data it can and physiologically explaining the problem. In the development, everything found in its review is addressed, incorporating all the subchapters that you want, for your better understanding.</i> • <i>Please, insert figures where they are mentioned in the text and not at the end.</i> 	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niorgy Rodriguez
Department, University & Country	Ciego de Avila Medical University, Cuba