

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129493
Title of the Manuscript:	Bone Graft Associated with Photobiomodulation in a Bariatric Surgery Patient: Case Report.
Type of the Article	Case report

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a novel case report on combining bone grafts with photobiomodulation therapy in a patient with post-bariatric surgery nutritional deficiencies. The research addresses an important gap in the management of alveolar bone preservation in patients with impaired bone remodeling. The findings suggest that this combined approach effectively maintains alveolar bone dimensions, enabling successful oral rehabilitation. The study's insights may contribute to improved clinical outcomes for a growing population undergoing bariatric surgery.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Bone Graft Associated with Photobiomodulation in a Bariatric Surgery Patient: Case Report," is clear and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a slightly modified title could better emphasize the significance, such as: "Efficacy of Bone Graft and Photobiomodulation in Alveolar Preservation: A Case Report in a Post-Bariatric Surgery Patient."	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the study, but it could benefit from more detail on the specific findings and their implications. Including the exact outcomes of bone remodeling and implant success rates would make the abstract more comprehensive.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate, with well-supported claims. The methodology for photobiomodulation and its parameters is detailed, and the results align with existing literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, with a good mix of foundational studies and contemporary research. However, including more recent systematic reviews or meta-analyses on photobiomodulation and bone grafting in similar patient populations might strengthen the discussion.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical and syntactical revisions would enhance clarity and readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript would benefit from:</p> <p>A detailed comparison of bone loss in bariatric patients versus non-bariatric patients undergoing similar treatment.</p> <p>A discussion on the limitations of the study, such as the sample size or case-specific factors.</p>	

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:	Hira Shaikh
Department, University & Country	Bahria University Health Sciences, Pakistan