

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_95390
Title of the Manuscript:	The Effectiveness of Chlorhexidine 0.2% Mouthwash vs. Chlorhexidine 0.2% Mouthwash and Toothbrush in Preventing Ventilator Associated Pneumonia a Randomized Controlled Trial
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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>An abstract should be viewed as a miniature version of the paper. The abstract should provide a brief summary of each of the main sections of the paper: introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. "An abstract can be defined as a summary of the information in a document."</p> <p>The abstract should state the principal objectives and scope of the investigation, describe the methods employed, summarize the results, and state the principal conclusions. The importance of the conclusions is indicated by the fact that they are often given three times: once in the abstract, again in the introduction, and again in the discussion.</p> <p>When writing the abstract, examine every word carefully. If you can tell your story in 100 words, do not use 200. Economically and scientifically, it doesn't make sense to waste words.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The first section of the text proper should, of course, be the introduction. The purpose of the introduction is to supply sufficient background information to allow the reader to understand and evaluate the results of the present study without needing to refer to previous publications on the topic.</p> <p>The introduction should present first, with all possible clarity, the nature and scope of the problem investigated. For example, it should indicate why the overall subject area of the research is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It should briefly review the pertinent literature to orient the reader. It also should identify the gap in the literature that the current research was intended to address. - It should then make clear the objective of the research. In some disciplines or journals, it is customary to state here the hypotheses or research questions that the study addressed. In others, the objective may be signaled by wording such as "in order to determine." - It should state the method of the investigation. If deemed necessary, the reasons for the choice of a particular method should be briefly stated. <p>Finally, in some disciplines and journals, the standard practice is to end the introduction by stating the principal results of the investigation and the principal conclusion.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Much as the methods and the results should correspond to each other, the introduction and the discussion should function as a pair. At least implicitly, the introduction should have posed one or more questions. The discussion should indicate what the findings say about the answers. Failure to address the initial questions commonly afflicts discussions. Be sure the discussion answers what the introduction asked.</p> <p>The citation order system is simply a system of citing the references (by number) in the order in which they appear in the paper. SO to Cite the References.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu-Hussein Muhamad
Department, University & Country	University of Naples Federico II, Italy