

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127659
Title of the Manuscript:	Dental changes in children undergoing orotracheal intubation: A longitudinal study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **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.	Although the study title/topic has its due importance but it has been addressed to look for enamel defects, which has been usually formed till 4 <sup>th</sup> month of intrauterine life. I would have been more appropriate to look for correlational effect of prolonged orotracheal incubation on neo-nates oral health in relation to overall dentition of the study subjects along any other deformity related to general health of these neonates as well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There is need to make it more appropriate as "Correlational effect of prolonged orotracheal incubation on neo-nates oral health in relation to overall dentition and general health"	
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 of the study should start with "Study Background or Introduction" not directly with "Study Objective" then study design has not been mentioned in an appropriate manner, it is basically a "Co-relational Study" its fine to be longitudinal and cohort and it is understood, the cohort studies are analytical in nature. Hence to phrase it in an appropriate scientific systematic manner.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript lacks its scientific systematic manner, need to follow journal instructions for the author strictly. The data collection, analysis, software used etc all need further due consideration with respect to cohort study to come up with correlation study analysis	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The study references are quite fine, hence appropriate	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Its okay, fine There is always room for improvement	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The study data analysis, its study tables, presentation of the study tables, then total number of the study subjects are too small hardly 26, which is scarce data to come up for a cohort study to calculate "r" as the co-efficient of correlation on such a small data, with almost no baseline data mentioned. While the study results tables are too many, not an appropriate way for manuscript write-up as scientific manner. There is was no need for most of the study results tables similarly its conclusion is also weak along with study objective which make the overall study rationale very weak as per its scientific value/implication.	

**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:	Muhammad Safdar Baig
Department, University & Country	College and Bahawal Victoria Hospital, Pakistan