

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</a>
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>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 authors provide compelling data and a rigorous methodology that lend credibility to their findings (especially ELISA test and SPSS 22.0 for statistical analysis). The importance of this study lies in its potential to advance understanding of the mechanism of relapse after orthodontic treatment, identifying and studying some meaningful markers- salivary Tec and Nesprin-2. The authors demonstrate an awareness of the ongoing discourse, positioning their work as a valuable addition to existing literature. By offering novel insights and/or innovative methods, this study holds promise for guiding future research directions and inspiring subsequent experimental or applied work. Although the number of patients is too small to extrapolate the results, the rigor of the study supports its relevance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Given that the study is conducted on a small group of patients, the title could include this information by mentioning 'in a group of patients from - [place of origin of the patients].	
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.	In my opinion, it would be good to mention the characteristics of the study groups: age, average age, gender, and place of origin.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Myabe the null hypothesis can be improved to make it more evident.	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness due to its rigorous methodology, precise data collection, and thorough analysis. The authors have applied established, peer-reviewed methods, ensuring that the data are both reliable and reproducible. Additionally, statistical tests are appropriately selected, well-executed, and clearly explained, strengthening the credibility of the findings. While the small sample size does limit the generalizability of the findings, the manuscript remains scientifically robust due to its rigorous study design and careful methodology. The authors may have clearly acknowledge the sample size as a limitation and have to take steps to ensure that, despite this constraint, the analysis is as reliable and accurate as possible within the scope of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Regarding the bibliography, I would advise the authors to consult more recent publications, considering that half of the references are older than five years, if possible. It might be advisable to add some recent and relevant titles in the field.	
Minor REVISION comments	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	No needed	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Laura Roxana Contac
Department, University & Country	George Emil Palade University of Medicine and Pharmacy Science and Technology, Romania