

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_86169
Title of the Manuscript:	Current mucoadhesive drug delivery system for recurrent aphthous stomatitis
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	This manuscript looks like a book chapter. A number of references was included in this review, but there is no way to know whether or not the authors picked up the references that were more aligned to what they believe concerning the subject. This can characterize selection bias and to make sure that every study on the subject is included. A lack of systematic selection of studies could lead to biased interpretation of results. The absence of objective and systematic selection criteria in review method substantially results in a number of methodological shortcomings leading to clear bias of the author's interpretation and conclusions. Therefore, the review must be organized in a systematic way, in order to minimize bias. The authors need to provide the mandatory components of a systematic review, such as create a distinct Materials and Methods section with the eligibility criteria, information sources (at least 3 databases are recommended), present full electronic search strategy, describe the data collection process, describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, state the principal summary measures, and describe the analyses conducted. Moreover, a Results section with the numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram, present data on risk of bias and quality assessment of each study, and a table with the study characteristics. Then in the discussion, besides discussing the results, the limitations of the review.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruno Chrcanovic
Department, University & Country	Malmö University, Sweden