

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_102220
Title of the Manuscript:	Valsalva Manoeuvre- a versatile diagnostic and therapeutic method
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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>Yes, it is. This study report details on the physiological changes and usage of Valsalva Manoeuvre in head and neck surgeries.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>No, aren't.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I suggest changing Fig No. 1 by Fig 1. The same consideration applies to the other figures. The article is well written despite not presenting a methodology. Standardize the references. <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>Yes, I do.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>Yes, they are.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sávio Morato de Lacerda Gontijo
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário Una, Brazil