

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_124316</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Ectopic tooth eruption – Integrative Literature Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

#### **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 '**Jack 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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her
<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>	This manuscript addresses a relevant topic, emphasizing the ectopic tooth eruption - integrative literature review. The manuscript is well conducted and evidenced by data. However, the manuscript contains some grammar errors and awkward phrasing. A comprehensive language review could improve readability.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes.	
<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>	The abstract could be slightly restructured to improve clarity and ensure that the key findings and their implications are immediately evident to readers.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Organize the results section and use subheadings for each section.	
<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 manuscript is well structured and provides an adequate rationale for the need for the study. The manuscript provides an overview of each method. The studies contribute significantly to the existing literature on ectopic tooth eruption.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Consistently use complete or incomplete journal titles in your references. All references should be expanded, updated, and standardized.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	All text should be reviewed. For example, the absence of periods, commas, and capital letters in the middle of the word, and spelling errors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Yahya H. Y. Alfarra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Ottawa, Canada</b>