

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_69066
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Use of Conventional and Mobile Application in Removable Partial Denture Designing</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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	<p>- Please state the full abbreviation of RPD in first used.</p> <p>- Introduction:</p> <p>(1) The general introduction is good but the authors miss the other introduction regarding the RPD principles, others method eg: conventional, apps.</p> <p>(2) Authors are highly encourage to include several past study</p> <p>- Tables:</p> <p>(1) Please rewrite the table by using table functions or standardize the size of the fonts when adjusting the size of table picture.</p> <p>(2) Standardize all the table format eg: table boarder.</p> <p>(3) Authors are suggested to write the table header for p-value&gt;0.05. Then for the data, put the value only like for table 3, ease of use 0.298. Please refer past studies the correct way to write.</p> <p>- Section 2:</p> <p>(1) DentALL RPD software designer – Please write more details regarding the software.</p> <p>(2) Please include the RPD principles (summarize)</p> <p>- Data result value: Please write a consistent decimal places value by categories.</p> <p>- Section 3:</p> <p>(1) “The conventional method is enough in teaching RPD designing as shown by its mean score of 4.02, and the conventional method is still their first choice in doing RPD designing with a mean score of 3.94. Overall, a general average of 4.0200 indicated that the respondents “Agree” that the conventional paper-based method.”</p> <p>Please rephrase. Repeated words may confused the reader.</p> <p>(2) Table 5: Please use small fonts for the value or rearrange the table to make it the value easy to read. It's not favour to present the data like the current form and hard to read.</p> <p>(3) Table 6 missing caption</p> <p>-Conclusion:</p> <p>Please rewrite the conclusion, your first sentences state that no difference at all, but second sentence is different. Please relate the objective.</p> <p>- Please include the limitation like why use students as respondents. The actual patients may not familiar with the technology like students.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nur Amirah Mohd Zahri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Malaya Malaysia</b>