

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_102779
Title of the Manuscript:	Ludwig's Angina with Evolution to Necrotizing Mediastinitis and Aorta Rupture Following to Death in a 23 Years-Old Woman
Type of the Article	Case Report

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.journaljamr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The paper presented proved useful. Publishing the manuscript will definitely research scholars researching on the topic. I recommend this paper for publication and privileged to review the paper. We hope to receive further research on the data analysis done 2) The title of the article corresponds to the content of the manuscript. 3)The abstract is exhaustive. 4) The subsections and the structure of the manuscript are compiled correctly. 5) I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct. 6) The links are fresh and sufficient. <p>I recommend studying the mechanism of action of light therapy with the Bioptron device and its use in all clinical cases of this pathology, even in the presence of oncology</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of the article in English is suitable for scientific communications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bitsoev Vladimir Dодtievich
Department, University & Country	State Budgetary Healthcare Institution of the Moscow, Russia