

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_121154
Title of the Manuscript:	Factors associated with prenatal dental care from the perspective of dental surgeons
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents an important investigation into the factors associated with prenatal dental care from the perspective of dental surgeons. This topic is crucial as it addresses the gaps and barriers in dental care for pregnant women, which is an essential aspect of maternal and infant health. The findings highlight significant issues such as the influence of myths and taboos, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the need for better guidance and information for both pregnant women and dental professionals. These insights are valuable for improving prenatal dental care practices and policies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured. It effectively summarizes the study's aims, methodology, results, and conclusions. No additions or deletions are necessary	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a well-defined methodology, including a cross-sectional study design, appropriate data collection instruments, and statistical analysis. The study addresses a significant public health issue, and the findings are supported by relevant data and statistical tests, ensuring the reliability and validity of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering a range of relevant studies and guidelines. No additional references are necessary.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical and typographical errors should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abrar Bakhsh
Department, University & Country	East Carolina University, United States