

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_127496
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of denture's continuous wearing as a factor predisposing to chronic atrophic candidiasis in a sample of Lebanese denture wearers: a clinico-microbiological study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	Given the significant number of edentulous people in the world, as well as the use of dentures, the study has scientific relevance. However, it needs adjustments for eventual publication.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, it is suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	It is well structured, I just suggest replacing the terms in the first person.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, they are appropriate.	
<b>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.</b>	The article is well structured, but I suggest corrections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ REFERENCE THE IMAGES – WHICH SOURCE WAS TAKEN FROM?;</li> <li>➤ PLACE THE CITATIONS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF PUBLICATION, THAT IS, FROM THE OLDEST TO THE MOST RECENT;</li> <li>➤ CHARACTERIZE WHAT TYPE OF STUDY AND WHAT APPROACH WAS USED (METHODOLOGY);</li> <li>➤ RESEARCH WITH HUMAN BEINGS WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM THE ETHICS COMMITTEE?</li> <li>➤ SOURCE OF THE TABLES (OWN AUTHORSHIP?);</li> <li>➤ SHALLOW DISCUSSION;</li> <li>➤ THE CONCLUSION DOES NOT PRESENT A COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THE OBJECTIVE PRESENTED.</li> </ul>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Some references are old, normally in the health area we use articles from the last 5 years. I suggest reviewing references that are more than 5 years old.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, they are.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No further comments.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lucina Thais Rangel Souza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Afya Faculdade de Ciências Médicas de Itabuna, Brazil</b>