

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124053
Title of the Manuscript:	ELEVEN-YEAR FOLLOW-UP OF CLASS III TREATMENT WITH ORTHODONTIC CAMOUFLAGE: A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	

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.	Developing Class III malocclusion is an enigma to an orthodontist due to its unpredictability and long term follow up probably 17-18 years in girls and 19-20 years in boys prior to definitive treatment can be carried out. Hence the diagnosis and treatment planning is very crucial in such patients. I do not like the manuscript since it has violated all the ethical and evidence based approach to the management of a patient.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript do not sync with the study. It is not a camouflage rather a functional jaw orthopaedics. This study is not a 11 year follow up. Follow up is determined from the post treatment stage rather than from pre treatment stage.	
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?	There are major flaws in the study. Diagnosis and treatment planning was adverse. Please see remarks : Diagnosis: a. Age of the patient mentioned is 3 years. What is the minimum age for addressing such patients? b. The diagnosis and treatment plan has been formulated since the beginning without describing the clinical features. Please correct the sequence of describing the case. Pl refer to some published standard case report c. The molar relation has been mentioned mesial terminal plane initially and later Angle's Class III malocclusion has been mentioned. Please correct. d. How was the diagnosis of facial asymmetry was formulated. Please add PA cephalogram analysis. e. What was the reason of facial asymmetry ? Was any investigation carried out ? f. Please describe the etiology of Skeletal Class III malocclusion? Was familial history ruled out ? g. How can someone think of surgical correction in a 3 year patient? Treatment Plan : a. Is facemask therapy considered camouflage or functional jaw orthopaedics ? b. What was the basis of treatment plan? Skeletal age and envelope of discrepancy needs to be mentioned? c. Please describe the elaborative treatment plan pertaining to facemask therapy – vector planning ? d. Extractions in growing Class III patient is a sin ? Was the facial asymmetry skeletal or dental ? Treatment progress: a. What are the guidelines of treating Class III malocclusion? Facemask therapy in a 3 yr old patient and that too with RME ? b. How was the vector determined ? c. Design of the splint needs to be mentioned ? d. Rationale for activation and deactivation of expansion ? e. Extractions in a growing Class III patients is a sin when the entire pubertal growth spurt is	

Review Form 3

	<p>remaining ? f. Please provide following records – appliance, mid treatment ? g. How was the retention planned ? h. What does follow up means ? Is the follow up determined from post treatment stage or pre treatment stage ?</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is neither scientifically nor technically correct. There are severe flaws in the study pertaining to the management of the patient. The management of the patient has been done unethically without following the principles of “Evidence based Orthodontics”? This study should not be published.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Inappropriate</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The authors should read some case report published in a standard journal.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dhruv Jain
Department, University & Country	Army Dental Centre (Research & Referral), Delhi University, India