

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	Case reports

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This article would have been relevant if it had presented the clinical case data after 11 years of follow-up, as determined in the title, however, they were not presented in the article.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title does not fit the scope of the article, as it did not present data after 11 years of treatment. The title should be: "Biphasic orthodontic treatment of severe Class III malocclusion."	
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.	I suggest adding important information, such as the indication of orthognathic surgery in the absence of early intervention and the severity of the reported case, highlighting the severe dolichofacial facial pattern with a jaw with marked prognathism, maxillary retraction and anterior and posterior crossbite.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, however, I suggest adding the topic "Treatment Alternatives".	
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.	Regarding the scientific accuracy of this manuscript, it could be considered scientifically robust and technically solid if it were directed to the severity of the case, the importance of the effectiveness of the treatment being initiated in the deciduous dentition with fixed corrective orthodontics in deciduous teeth, followed by facial orthopedics, ending with compensatory fixed corrective orthodontics with extractions of the first lower premolars.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References from renowned authors were forgotten, among which: Baccetti, T., Franchi, L., McNamara Jr, J. A., & Tollaro, I. (1997). Early dentofacial features of Class II malocclusion: a longitudinal study from the deciduous through the mixed dentition. <i>American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics</i> , 111(5), 502-509. I also suggest including systematic reviews of the literature, such as: Toffol, L. D., Pavoni, C., Baccetti, T., Franchi, L., & Cozza, P. (2008). Orthopedic treatment outcomes in Class III malocclusion: a systematic review. <i>The Angle Orthodontist</i> , 78(3), 561-573. I also suggest replacing some older references with more recent ones. Reference 26. Mota DTV da. Preventive and Interceptive Orthodontics. 2019 is incomplete. Finally, an article from a work developed in Brazil. such as: Rutili, V., Souki, B. Q., Nieri, M., Carlos, A. L. F. M., Pavoni, C., Cozza, P., ... & Franchi, L. (2024). Long-term effects produced by early treatment of Class III malocclusion with rapid maxillary expansion and facemask followed by fixed appliances: A multicentre retro-prospective controlled study. <i>Orthodontics & Craniofacial Research</i> , 27(3), 429-438.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pedro Cesar Fernandes Dos Santos
Department, University & Country	Federal of Ceara University, Brazil