

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JCTI_101873</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OSTEORADIONECROSIS AND MEDICATION-RELATED OSTEONECROSIS OF THE JAW</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review 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.journaljcti.com/index.php/JCTI/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Good title, easy to understand</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to add as suggestions</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I think so</li> </ul> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please refer to the manuscript and comments</li> </ul> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>My suggestions:</b></p> <p>1. Typically, abstracts consist of: Background: Too long (Please simplify it) Objective: OK Materials and methods: Need to be stated Results: Need to be stated Conclusions: Need to be stated * So that the reader has a general idea of what your study is about.</p> <p>2. Please rearrange the references according to alphabetical order</p> <p>3. If possible, please find the most recent references up to 5 years.</p> <p>4. Please redo the labelling on each of the Figures and Tables – capitalize each words</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Yes, it is. Easy to understand</li> </ul>	As attached in the paper	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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:	<b>Wan Muhamad Amir Bin W Ahmad</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Dental Sciences, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia</b>