



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_48861
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Selenomonas noxia among pediatric and orthodontic patients
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The introduction fails to describe the area of interest. ii) The rationale for the study has not been clearly put forward. iii) The information and paragraphs are not well arranged, they lack continuity. They drag the reader from the objective of the study. <p>Recommendation: The introduction needs to be restructured and rewritten. Base the literature search around the objectives of the study. Provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done.</p> <p>Material and method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The type of study has been described, and it was a retrospective study. ii) When was this study carried out? It would give valuable information, especially in case someone will do a similar study in the same population in the future, for comparison. iii) Statement of ethical clearance has been given. iv) What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria?. v) Which statistical sampling technique was used?. I believe the 50 saliva samples used in this study were selected from a large pool of patients' saliva samples. vi) the methodology is not descriptive enough as far as statistical methods used to compare the results. vii) The laboratory part of the methodology has been well written and is clearly understood. <p>Recommendation: Restructure methodology, it is lacking some necessary information.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Authors have not interpreted the results in relation to the research purpose. 	<p>The authors have reviewed these comments and respectfully disagree. More specifically, the introduction does, in fact, describe the area of interest – as well as the rationale for the study.</p> <p>The introduction is structured into topical paragraphs. Paragraph one involves a brief discussion of pediatric patients, periodontal health and orthodontics – the main focus of this study. The second paragraph is about the specific periodontal pathogen, S. noxia. The third paragraph outlines the lack of prevalence studies regarding this organism. The final paragraph describes the objective/goal of the study. The authors believe this is a cohesive narrative that provides evidence and literature survey regarding a clearly defined problem and a clear justification and scope of the study.</p> <p>The authors have reviewed these comments and have made several revisions to address these specific concerns. Comments i, iii, vii do not require revisions. The other comments are addressed in the revised sections, which now reads:</p> <p>Comment ii and iv: Sample selection The original protocol for saliva collection involved Informed Consent (adult) and Pediatric Assent (pediatric) prior to unstimulated saliva collection. The original collection period for these samples took place between July 2015 and July 2018. In brief, the inclusion criteria were pediatric patients aged seven (7) years or older and their parents or guardians who agreed to participate. Pediatric assent and Parental permission to consent for voluntary participation were obtained at the time of study enrollment. Adult patients were recruited from the general clinic and provided Informed Consent. Exclusion criteria included any person (pediatric or adult) that was not a patient of record at UNLV-SDM, any patients who declined to participate, and any parent or guardian that declined to let their child participate.</p> <p>Comment v: For this study, a total of fifty (n=50) samples were selected for screening. This study population involved the first, randomly selected twenty five (n=25) orthodontic samples with twenty five (n=25) age-matched non-orthodontic samples, selected from patients between the ages of 12 – 24.</p> <p>Comment vi: Statistical analysis Basic demographic information regarding the study sample (age, sex, race or ethnicity) were compiled and presented using simple descriptive statistics (counts and percentages). Any statistical differences between the demographic groups were determined using Chi square analysis, which is appropriate for non-parametric data.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>ii) Authors have highlighted the result but inadequately.</p> <p>iii) The discussion is very short and does not discuss the results</p> <p>iv) The authors have not disclosed the importance of the research findings to the community and for the practice</p> <p><i>Recommendation: improve the discussion.</i></p>	<p>The authors have reviewed these comments and respectfully disagree. For example, comment i) states the authors have not interpreted the results in relation to the research purpose. Paragraph one clearly re-states the research purpose and then how this study successfully achieves that goal and objective.</p> <p>The authors respectfully disagree. The results section thoroughly describes the results and they are concisely discussed in relation to other studies, clearly outlining the differences and similarities with other studies.</p> <p>The authors have clearly outlined the importance of this study and the relevance in the conclusion section.</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>The Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The length is Ok. ii) The title is confusing when considering the contents of the manuscript. As a reader, it gives the impression that the whole study was based on pediatric patients. <p>Recommendation: <i>The title is supposed to clearly reflect the contents of the article, which is lacking. I would suggest the title to be modified to “Prevalence of Selenomonas noxia among patients undergoing orthodontic treatment”.</i></p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Number of words is within the range of journal requirement. ii) The objective has been mixed with the background. iii) The objective of the study has not been written properly. iv) the section of material and method is not informative enough, Example the author use the words ‘orthodontic samples’ and ‘non-orthodontic samples’. This makes a reader confused, as what were these samples, was it tooth?, gingival clavicular fluid?. Were there any statistical analysis carried out? v) No grammatical errors noted. vi) The result section: sufficient information is given. vii) Conclusion: It does support the findings. <p>Recommendation: <i>The abstract is the part which will make the reader either interested or not to read the article. It is ‘the reception part’ and if it is attractive, then people will read the work. Please re-write the abstract according to journal instructions, especially the objective and methodology sections.</i></p> <p>Keywords:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Keywords have been provided <p>Recommendation: <i>the keyword periodontal disease should be removed, the study was based on patients undergoing orthodontic treatment and not those with periodontal diseases. I would suggest adding the word PREVALENCE.</i></p>	<p>The authors have reviewed this comment and have revised the title appropriately to read:</p> <p>Prevalence of Selenomonas noxia among Pediatric and Adult Orthodontic patients</p> <p>Comments ii and iii: The authors have reviewed these comments and have changed the objective section, which now reads:</p> <p>Objectives: Due to the paucity of evidence regarding the oral prevalence of S. noxia and the lack of evidence regarding the prevalence among pediatric orthodontic patients, the main objective of this project was to evaluate the oral prevalence in a dental school setting.</p> <p>This section has been revised to address these concerns, as follows:</p> <p>Methods: Using an existing saliva repository, twenty five (n=25) orthodontic saliva samples were selected from patients between the ages of 13 – 24 with twenty five (n=25) age-matched non-orthodontic saliva samples. DNA isolation was performed and screened with primers specific for S. noxia. . Chi square analysis of demographic groups was performed and descriptive statistics of all results was reported.</p>
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

		<p>The authors have reviewed this comment and concur. The keywords section has been revised to read:</p> <p>Key words: Selenomonas noxia, prevalence, orthodontic treatment, saliva screening.</p>
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall Assessment of the manuscript, titled: Prevalence of <i>Selenomonas noxia</i> among pediatric and orthodontic patients</p> <p><i>The authors should be congratulated for coming up with such a novel idea.</i></p> <p><i>Despite having a good idea, the authors have failed to write a good and clear background/ introduction and the methodology lacks important information. There was some injustice done in writing the discussion, provided the results are very good. Finally, the conclusion supports the results of the study. Moreover, the title requires some modification, so does the abstract.</i></p> <p>Structure and length:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) It is moderately lengthy paper ii) The article is not satisfactorily organized nor balanced, especially the introduction and discussion sections. iii) It has relevant information. <p><i>Recommendation: the article needs to be improved.</i></p> <p>Logic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The introduction has not been written clearly. ii) There is a minimum violation of grammar hence one can grab the information easily. <p><i>Recommendation: Restructure the manuscript.</i></p> <p>Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Tables have been clearly presented. <p><i>Recommendation: None</i></p> <p>English:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The English used in the article is fairly good and it does aid to convey the scientific meaning ii) There are very few grammatical mistakes. <p><i>Recommendation: None</i></p> <p><u>Scientific quality rating</u></p> <p>Novelty and originality: The idea of the research is good. There is a significant contribution of the article to the knowledge pool.</p> <p>Importance and impact: The information in the article may lead to advancement in the relevant field of research.</p>	
---	---	--



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

	Completeness of presentation: The presentation is beyond the standard for a complete scientific article at its present state.	
--	--	--

PART 2:

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