

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_86255
Title of the Manuscript:	The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on dental practice and the acceptance and attitude of Indian Dental Professionals towards COVID-19 vaccine – A Cross-Sectional observational Survey.
Type of the Article	Short 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:

(<https://www.journalajrid.com/index.php/AJRID/editorial-policy> )

## 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>THERE IS NO CORRELATION BETWEEN OBJECTIVE , METHODOLOGY AND CONCLUSION.</b></p> <p><b>Most of Data Collected is irrelevant to objective like demography and professional question.</b></p> <p><b>Except one question in last table none of the questions shows any relevance to conclusion or to show any correlation between objective, results and conclusion</b></p> <p><b>Introduction shows general information from literature known to all, but fail to give rationale or justification of conducting this survey and reason that how it will affect existing knowledge, practice and trends.</b></p> <p><b>No study design is given or duration of study given</b></p> <p><b>How questionnaire designed – needs to give brief details or if adopted give ref</b></p> <p><b>How validity and reliability of tool ensure- not given</b></p> <p><b>How this data collected and patients were included in study – give inclusion/exclusion criteria</b></p> <p><b>Results: majority of given results are out of relevance and beyond scope of objctive</b></p> <p><b>Discussion is weakest part of this manuscript. It is not in correlation with results or objective – it should be focused on objective only</b></p>	<p><b>OBJECTIVE WAS : ATTITUDE OF DENTAL PROFESSIONALS TOWARDS VACCINATION .</b></p> <p><b>SECONDARY OBJECTIVE WAS : CHANGES THEY MADE IN PRACTICE.</b></p> <p><b>IN METHODOLOGY :</b></p> <p><b>QUESTIONS WERE ASKED ABOUT HOW MANY OF THEM GOT THEMSELVES VACCINATED.WHAT WERE THE SIDE EFFECTS THEY EXPERIENCED.</b></p> <p><b>WHAT CHANGES THEY MADE IN THEIR PRACTICE ,WHAT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES THEY TOOK,DID THEY OPT FOR TELECONSULTATIONS.</b></p> <p><b>DURATION OF STUDY : The data was collected from 29.07.21 to 12.09.21</b></p> <p><b>DATA COLLECTION : This survey is a cross sectional study conducted among the dental professionals (specialist and general dentists who work in government or private sector or both) using chain referral sampling method. Google form was used to design an online self administered questionnaire and it was disseminated through what's app to the dental professionals. In addition a snowball sampling technique was used to reach out to more dentists by encouraging them to forward or share the online survey link to others. This approach was adopted because of the existing nature of the pandemic as it offers social distancing and movement of researchers or participants is also restricted. Participation in the study was voluntary.</b></p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Needs sentences revision, grammar check at places</p> <p>At places in introduction/discussion the sentences are not coherent with each other and poor sentence construction is noted</p> <p>Lot of repetitions</p> <p>Lot of unnecessary details beyond the scope of objective were noted – needs revision</p>	<p><b>CORRECTIONS DONE .</b></p>
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p><b>Ethical approval was sought and received from PGIMER, ethics committee. All participants gave informed consent.</b></p>