

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_128020
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN CONVENTIONAL MOLDING AND SCANNING IN FIXED PROSTHESIS: a narrative review
Type of the Article	Review 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Suggestions</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>Numerical data should be included or specific findings from the results to make the abstract more informative.</p> <p>Streamline the language to enhance clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction is informative but could be more engaging. Consider starting with a compelling statistic or a clinical scenario.</p> <p>Highlight the clinical relevance of the study more prominently.</p> <p>Methodology:</p> <p>Add more details about the exclusion criteria, such as what constitutes "incomplete articles."</p> <p>Clarify if any quality assessment was performed on the included studies.</p> <p>Results and Discussion:</p> <p>Use tables or charts to summarize key findings for clarity and better visual impact.</p> <p>Ensure that conflicting findings among studies are addressed with possible explanations.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The conclusion could be expanded to suggest future research directions or potential implications for clinical practice.</p> <p>Language and Style:</p> <p>Some sentences are lengthy and could benefit from being split for better readability.</p> <p>Review the text for minor grammatical errors and improve word choices for greater precision.</p> <p>Figures and Tables:</p> <p>Ensure that all figures and tables are referenced in the text.</p> <p>Enhance the visual appeal of the search strategy diagram (if provided).</p> <p>References:</p>	

Review Form 3

	Consistency in the reference format (e.g., journal titles, capitalization).	
--	---	--

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:	Ashfaq Yaqoob
Department, University & Country	King Khalid University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia