

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81693
Title of the Manuscript:	CARIES RISK ASSESSMENT AND DETECTION OF STREPTOCOCCUS MUTANS COUNT IN PLAQUE AND SALIVA USING MUTANS-SANGUIS AGAR
Type of the Article	Original research papers

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.journalipri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Reviewer's General Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript is sufficiently robust, technically sound, interesting and will gain a large number of readers2. I suggest adding the acknowledgments after Completion <p>Reviewer's Comments for Abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I suggest removing the 1st paragraph and reducing the 2nd paragraph of your abstract because it was too long and if necessary, reduce the text more because of the number of words. <p>Reviewer Comments for Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Dear author, it is advisable to justify why you used this age group using bibliographical references for this. This will enhance your work. I also suggest that you place, add the type of study, ethical issues, detail your variables studied, detail the age groups studied, the type of statistical analysis and the criteria used in the analysis. <p>Reviewer Comments for Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Data is well controlled and robust2. Statistical were sufficient and appropriate3. Dear author, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of your results should be in your methodology <p>Reviewer Comments for Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. References are relevant and current2. The facts and figures are real <p>Reviewer Comments for References:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Dear author, your references do not follow the norms, in the INTRODUCTION topic, your references are without the square brackets, they must be between square brackets in the text, in the bibliographical references they are presented in alphabetical order and with numbers, please make corrections. According to submission rules: "The references listed at the end of the manuscript must be numbered in the order they appear in the text. In the text, citations must be indicated by the reference number in square brackets [3].2. In the INTRODUCTION topic, your references end at number 14, when you reach your DISCUSSION topic, your references start at number 52 and all the others in this topic are out of order, so they are not in the rules.3. As throughout your text the references are not correct, correct them according to the journal's rules, placing them enumerated, in the order in which they appear in the text and without underlining. All those cited must be on your final list, neither more nor less. <p>Reviewer Comments for Conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The conclusion is supported by the manuscript data.2. I strongly suggest that you use the text of your CONCLUSION to supplement your DISCUSSION and rewrite your CONCLUSION based on your results obtained just as you did in the conclusion of your abstract.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Removed and revised the content of two paragraphs.- The enrolled patients were segregated based on their caries risk as per ADA form and not according to their age.- It is an analytical study and ethical clearance was obtained from the institutional ethical committee.- As we had used only saliva and plaque samples, it did not have any rejection requests by the participants.- Our participant age group ranged from 16-60 years.- ANOVA and Independent samples T test were performed with SPSS- Results and methodology content has been added to the abstract.- References have been modified into square brackets.- Total references are rectified as per comments.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Reviewer Comments for Methodology:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I suggest that annex 1 on ADA be removed and the table reference cited in the text explaining low, moderate and high caries risk.2. I suggest removing figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, keeping figures 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17. <p>Reviewer Comments for Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. When presenting your results, choose a form of presentation, either graphic and text or table and text to avoid being repetitive.2. When describing the results of your table 4 you report that you had 20 moderate cases related to drug/alcohol abuse but your table is zero.3. From table 6, it would be better if you organized your tables in order to be more self-explanatory, in addition, you could not put the total of all ages individually, but by age group studied and sex.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Annexure ADA has been removed.- Figures 1-10 has been removed.- Repeated tables and graphs have been removed.- Discussion has been modified accordingly

Review Form 1.6

	<p>4. From table 10 you presented your results in tables and graphs, the graphical presentation got better. I also suggest that you remove the text written on these tables with non-significant results, it is necessary to write only when they are significant. In this way you could write a paragraph just at the end of these tables saying that the results of the variables (cite the variables and comparisons made) and say that they did not obtain significant results for both plaque and saliva.</p> <p>Reviewer Comments for Discussion</p> <p>1. I suggest starting your DISCUSSION with reflections on your results and then making comparisons with other current studies.</p> <p>2. In the 9th paragraph of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting the phrase in the METHODOLOGY; “Hence, we have used the ADA caries risk assessment form among our study samples to ascertain their caries risk and compare it with their MS levels in saliva and plaque.”</p> <p>In the 13th paragraph of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting the phrase in the METHODOLOGY; Hence, The present study was conducted in the outpatient department of Surendera Dental College and Research Institute, Sriganganagar, Rajasthan, India. The study protocol was ethically approved and the written informed consent was obtained from the selected participants.</p> <p>In the 14th paragraph of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting the phrase in the METHODOLOGY; In our study, the ADA caries risk assessment form was used to ascertain the caries risk of the individual participant.</p> <p>In the 16th paragraph of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting the phrase in the METHODOLOGY; The S.mutans colonies were greyish-yellow in color and those of S.sanguis were colourless.</p> <p>In the 17th paragraph of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting the phrase in the METHODOLOGY; The tabulated data were subjected to statistical analysis using ANOVA and t-test.</p> <p>The 18th to 21st, 23rd to 26th, 28th to 34th paragraphs of your DISCUSSION I suggest putting in your RESULTS.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	No ethical issues. Ethical clearance was obtained from the institutional ethics committee.