

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_95548
Title of the Manuscript:	Three-dimensional evaluation of the upper airway after orthognatic surgery in angle Class II and Class III patients
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 2. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 3. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 4. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 5. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, maxillary advancement or mandibular set back or bi jaw surgeries have their impact on airway dimensions. "Breath healthy" is the new concept and trend. Any adverse effect might lead to Obstructive sleep Apnea. Thus, it is important to orthodontists as well oral surgeons in diagnosis and treatment planning Title is aptly selected abstract is comprehensive. yes yes references are good enough. They have referred orthodontic as well surgical aspects	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Satisfactory	
Optional/General comments	Surgical cases description could have been more specific like high angle, low angle, high vertical, low vertical	

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:	H. Jyothikiran
Department, University & Country	Jss Academy of Higher Education and Research, India