

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_80825
Title of the Manuscript:	Alveolar ridge splitting technique with simultaneous implant placement in anterior mandible for removable mandibular implant supported prosthesis.
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This article refers to the Alveolar ridge splitting technique with simultaneous implant placement in anterior mandible for removable mandibular implant supported prosthesis.</p> <p>The authors present the results of the treatment of twelve patients, showing the surgical procedure and the methodology in a detailed and orderly manner, focusing on the results and the performance of the technique.</p> <p>Clinical photographs of the different surgical steps are shown.</p> <p>However, there are some questions and suggestions to the article that are detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In this study, what was the minimum amount of alveolar bone taken into account to carry out the separation of the alveolar crest? 2. What parameters were taken into account to determine the state of the alveolar bone to indicate surgery? The technique with which the evaluation was carried out is mentioned, but it is not mentioned what parameters were considered as a good bone regeneration. 3. In the results, it is suggested to change the mention of the bone regeneration evaluation technique to material and method. 4. In the discussion, the authors are suggested, in this section, to emphasize the condition or characteristic that makes this series of cases publishable and remarkable, since the results are not new and provide little information from the point of scientific evidence. 5. Finally, the conclusion and recommendations should be cautious, as this treatment cannot be recommended based on a small group of cases, even if the results are considered successful by the authors. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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:	Eugenia Henriquez-D'Aquino
Department, University & Country	University of Chile, Chile