

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_122255
Title of the Manuscript:	Tomographic comparison of changes in the nasopharynx after treatment with MARPE and self-ligating appliances
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The study has shown that MARPE group have a statistically greater increase in nasopharyngeal measurements, ie, sagittal area, minimum axial area and volume, with treatment, than the self-ligating group.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sampling technique has not been mentioned. 2. How was the sample divided into two groups? 3. Please mention the length and diameter of miniscrew. Also mention of the brand of miniscrew used. 4. The start and completion of treatment is not mentioned. Also, the date for data collection is not mentioned. 5. Was any treatment stopped midway is not mentioned? 6. Was there any complications associated with miniscrew treatment approach is not mentioned? 7. The limitation of the study is not mentioned? 8. The source of funding is not mentioned? 	
<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 study has used the proper methodology, statistical tests are correct.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are few grammatical mistakes which has been highlighted in the file attached.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Nabin Kumar Chaudhary
Department, University & Country	Nepalgunj Medical College, Nepal