

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126846
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of profile attractiveness after compensatory filler in different regions of the face in individuals with chin deficiency
Type of the 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	Patients are now much more focused on appearance. The appearance of facial profile treatments for the chin, nose, and lips was compared in this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate, but for more detail, include the type of study.	
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.	Key words should be arranged in alphabetical order.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are fine.	
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 study compared the improvement in the appearance of the facial profile when treatments are carried out to the chin alone, to the chin and nose, and to the chin, nose, and lips together. It must be technically and scientifically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please check references in accordance with the journal's format	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, the language and English quality of the article are fine, but please check the grammar and sentence formation once. • Please include abbreviations for any short terms used in the article • The type of the article column appears empty. Please provide the relevant response • Once, please review the guidelines. 	
Optional/General comments	The article is good and interesting.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K.Yamini
Department, University & Country	Narayana Dental College and Hospital, India