

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_119345
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF THE NEED TO USE FACEBOW IN CONVENTIONAL COMPLETE PROSTHESES – INTEGRATIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijrrd.com/index.php/IJRRD/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, but the use of the word "integrative" is misleading and inappropriate. The numbers of literatures included were also too small.</p> <p>No. "The use of facebow in complete denture construction – a review"</p> <p>Not really.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but the methodology, result and discussion were inadequate</p> <p>No. for a scientific writing the references were too little. The authors need to broaden their literature search</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Need some improvement</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Standardise the use of abbreviations and wording, especially the important word that you use very often in the manuscript –"facebow"</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:	Seng-Boon Chu
Department, University & Country	International Islamic University, Malaysia