

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_126789
Title of the Manuscript:	SALIVARY TEC AND NESPRIN-2 LEVELS IN POST-ORTHODONTIC PATIENTS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	New markers have been evaluated in this study rather than traditional markers. Methodology is appropriate. Execution of study is appropriate.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the study needs to be elaborate. Eg: Comparative evaluation of Salivary tec and nesprin-2 levels in post-orthodontic Malaysian patients: A Prospective randomised clinical trial.	
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.	Incorporate a small section of Clinical Significance of the aforementioned study in the abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	appropriate	
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.	No studies have yet examined the levels of Tec and Nesprin-2 in the saliva of post-orthodontic patients utilizing the ELISA technique. Prior research examined the concentrations of diverse biomarkers in the gingival crevicular fluid. OPG and bone alkaline phosphatase (BALP) have the potential to detect alveolar bone formation, while receptor activator of nuclear factor kappa-B ligand (RANKL) serves as a marker for resorption	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	appropriate	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>suitable</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Give reference for this statement: Studies demonstrate that females pursue orthodontic treatment more frequently than males, influenced by diverse psychosocial and aesthetic considerations. 2) Provide more references to support this statement: The limited presence of Nesprin-2 in the debond group correlates with the postponed expression of bone mineralization markers (osteopontin and osteocalcin), which are typically expressed in the later phases of anabolic bone remodelling 3) Mention limitations of the study. 4) Mention about limited population used for this study. 5) Mention in detail about any drop out or repeat ELISAs if any in Methodology section 6) Mention whether a single individual was assigned the duty of collection of saliva samples or multiple people did it. 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Hitesh Ramdas Sawant</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be) University Dental College and Hospital, India</p>