

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_90246
Title of the Manuscript:	Visibility of the mandibular canal: from two-dimensional radiography to three-dimensional imaging
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This article was classified as a literature review, but there is no such topic in the manuscript. I suggest adding the literature review topic to suit your rating. 2. The topic "Methods" should indicate how and how the authors made the article, including the means used. For example: "This work is a literature review with collection of scientific articles, on imaging exam findings for mandibular canal visibility. To this end, a literature review was carried out, with articles in English, in the PubMed database, published between the years 2017 to 2022". The Methods topic, as written, is intended to be part of a literature review. I suggest rewriting. 3. The "Discussion" is the heart of the manuscript, in which the greatest number of scientific research must be explored and conflicted. The discussion of this article is poor, there is no conflict or comparison of studies and results. The discussion of this manuscript is looking like a continuation of the literature review topic. I suggest rewriting contemplating what has been exposed. 4. It is not clear that the images used in the manuscript are from the authors' archives or taken from some source. In writing you need to be clear. 5. References: It is suggested to use current references up to 5 years old. 	
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:	Denis Damião Costa
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Bahia, Brazil