



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. ii) Authors have highlighted the result but inadequately. iii) The discussion is very short and does not discuss the results iv) The authors have not disclosed the importance of the research findings to the community and for the practice <p>Recommendation: improve the discussion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The Title:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The length is Ok. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>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> <p>Recommendation: 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”.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>i) Number of words is within the range of journal requirement.</p> <p>ii) The objective has been mixed with the background.</p> <p>iii) The objective of the study has not been written properly.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>v) No grammatical errors noted.</p> <p>vi) The result section: sufficient information is given.</p> <p>vii) Conclusion: It does support the findings.</p> <p>Recommendation: 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.</p> <p>Keywords:</p> <p>i) Keywords have been provided</p> <p>Recommendation: 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.</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>Recommendation: the article needs to be improved.</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>Recommendation: Restructure the manuscript.</p> <p>Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Tables have been clearly presented. <p>Recommendation: None</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>Recommendation: None</p> <p>Scientific quality rating</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> <p>Completeness of presentation: The presentation is beyond the standard for a complete scientific article at its present state.</p>	
---	--	--

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?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Karpal Singh Sohal
Department, University & Country	Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences , Tanzania