

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_118840
Title of the Manuscript:	Nigerian orthodontic patients' satisfaction with duration of treatment, perception and attitude toward accelerated orthodontics in a University Teaching Hospital
Type of the Article	

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Some what specially for africans</p> <p>I think its better; Nigerian orthodontic patients; satisfaction with duration of the conventional orthodontic treatment, expectation and attitude toward accelerated orthodontics in a university teaching hospital</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes. according to the journal preferences some subsections like consent and ethical approval could be removed and placed under other proper section</p> <p>It needs better discussion and analizing but yes</p> <p>They are too many for a descriptive study, and some are similar,citation style needs to correct</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>No.it needs many changes I commented on the reivewed word file.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1-i commented in second word file where I could, and suggested some words</p> <p>2-numbers must not be at the beginning of sentence.</p> <p>3-a patient that has not experienced AO,can not have a reliable perception of problems of the AO ,just can expect his/her understanding that is dependent on the quality and quantity of the researchers explaining</p> <p>4-the manuscript is too long for a descriptive study, if some of low important tables deleted and the results just explained in the short texts, it is better and make manuscript shorter</p> <p>5-i think it is better to reduce references numbers, some ref with lower importance and very similar can be removed and citation needs to change</p> <p>6-some sentences need to change to be correct grammarly</p> <p>7-there are repeated results in discussion and the discussion has to be edited</p> <p>8-percentages must be out of parenthesis and numbers in it</p> <p>9-i suggest study on patients that have completed their treatment and have experiences about AO and conventional orthodontics problems such as pain , healing period , problem for eating and brushing and root resorption and etc during AO and conventional orthodontics ,so they have better perception and insight about them and their responces are more reliable</p> <p>10-i suggest study on each AO adjunct such as corticotomy ,piezo ,drugs and etc separately on the treatment time</p> <p>11- I highlighted in yellow some words or sentences. I commented my opinion for some, and other needs to change grammarly or interpretively or using more proper words.or repeated results</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**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:	Mohammadsadegh Safarian
Department, University & Country	Shahed University, Iran