

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_112161
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSOCIATION OF ELLI'S CLASS 1 FRACTURE IN CHILDREN IN BETWEEN THE AGE GROUP OF 13-18 YEARS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This manuscript examines the incidence of Elli's Class I fracture in children aged 13-18 years by sex. This is not a new topic and has been reported on previously. The manuscript needs revision prior to acceptance.</p> <p>The title is unsuitable. I would suggest: The frequency of Elli's Class I fracture in males and females aged 13-18 years The word relationship is not accurate here as no relationship has been examined. Moreover, 18-year-old individuals would mostly not be classified as children. The author should focus on the sex-based findings here.</p> <p>The abstract is not well written. There are some partly written sentences. For example, "Take note of the extent of the fracture as well as the patient's age." And "Ellis I fractures involve only the enamel. make the diagnosis." In one instance the author states the instance of ellis class I fracture is 35.29% in females, and in the next sentence, it is 55.88%. A concluding statement on the impact of the findings has not been included.</p> <p>I would suggest that the results and discussion be reported and discussed separately.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate; however, the results can be presented more coherently and clearly.</p> <p>There are a few references that are over 20 years old. (references 6, 10, 11, 13, and 17) These should be replaced with more recent references.</p> <p>Study limitations and scope for future research should be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript needs extensive editing for language and grammar. The study has also not been written in an academic tone. The authors would benefit from getting their study checked by a native English speaker.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Sex and gender are different terms that cannot be used interchangeably. The author means biological "sex" here and all instances of "gender" should be revised to "sex."</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Namrata Dalal
Department, University & Country	India