



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_44408
Title of the Manuscript:	Obesity and dental caries in children and adolescents
Type of the 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Introduction -too long, too many details, the Introduction should be shortened to 3-4 paragraphs with the most important data from this part; some sentences are very similar so the facts are repeating in the text; some sentences are too long and it is hard to understand what the authors wanted to say -some data from the introduction could go in the Discussion part -English language quality should be improved throughout the entire manuscript -references should be cited for every information given, and not just at the end of the paragraphs (lines 45, 59, 72, 80, 87 and so on) -every sentence should begin with capital letter (line 35-Although, line 41-There, line 47-Initial and so on through the entire manuscript)</p> <p>Aims -improve English quality</p> <p>Materials and Methods -line 174- what about 2016? The sentence from the abstract is more precise -number of studies included in the review??</p> <p>Statistical analyses -in this paragraph the authors should describe the method of statistical analysis they have used (if any) in this review, and the explanation about different methods of statistical analysis used in studies included, or variation in sample sizes in this review should be mentioned in the discussion</p> <p>Sample size -I suggest that data about indices which were used for caries assessment in dentition and which BMI indices and growth references were applied in studies included in this review should be added in the Table 1, and then they don't have to be explained so detailed in the text -some references are mentioned in the text, but they are not added in the reference list (for example, line 247-Liang et al., line 248-Kumar et al., line 253-Soares et al...)</p> <p>Confounding factors -limitations of the studies should go in the Discussion part</p> <p>Results -there is no mentioning of Picture 1 and/or 2 in the text, although they are presented in the end of the manuscript</p> <p>Limitations and future considerations -in the Discussion part</p> <p>Discussion -line 342- "our research" –there is no reference cited for this research -sentences are too long and hard to understand Discussion is the part of the manuscript where the authors should discuss their results, or compare their results with the results of other authors, if there are some. For example, first they should discuss all studies which have found positive correlation of obesity and caries, and then all studies which did not found positive</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>correlation between these two</p> <p>Picture 1 and/or 2 -choose one of them because these are the same data, displayed differently</p> <p>Conclusion -conclusion should be their own conclusion, without citing other authors</p> <p>References -the reference list is not prepared according to the instructions of the journal -for some articles the authors are missing -some references mentioned in the text are not in the reference list -the references are not in alphabetical order</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Božana Lončar Brzak
Department, University & Country	University of Zagreb, Croatia