

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_122731
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSOCIATION BETWEEN MATERNAL-NEONATAL SEPARATION STRESS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALGIAS IN PRECLINICAL TRIALS: AN INTEGRATIVE LITERATURE REVIEW
Type of the Article	Review 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.	The article presents a very interesting subject, the one of the possible correlation ship between maternal separation from the new born and pain perception. Therefore, the study underlines the fact that this premature separation can conduct to different troubles of perception such as reduction of the threshold of sensitization of nociceptors, amplifying the response to different stimuli or apparition of painful sensations, with special interest to orofacial pain	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	We consider that the manuscript is scientifically correct. It includes a significant number of references. It is focused on a very interesting subject. Once this correlation ship is clearly established, a significant number of cases are expected to benefit from an improved quality of life	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nicolae Bacalbasa
Department, University & Country	Romania

Review Form 3