

## 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abbreviations given in the abstract are not expanded. Eg: VAP, CPIS etc. Although an appendix is included at the end of the manuscript, it would be good to have the abbreviations of abstract in full.</li> <li>2. The final conclusion of the abstract doesn't suit the title of the study. It was concluded as "Thus, VAP remains an important clinical problem in intensive care unit." But the article is not whether VAP remains as problem or not.</li> <li>3. The aim in the abstract is not clearly mentioned. In the study methodology, the aim of study is given as "The present study was under taken to compare the effectiveness of chlorhexidine mouth wash and chlorhexidine mouth wash with tooth brush in...." whereas it is not clearly conveyed in the abstract.</li> <li>4. CPIS scoring system is better to be included in the text than at the appendix.</li> <li>5. What comprises the study and control groups is not explained properly in the study methodology. In the study methodology 2.17, the study population were divided into Group A and B, but no mention was made about the experimental and control group.</li> <li>6. The manuscript is very lengthy. It is better to stay on the topic, and not include the demographic details.</li> <li>7. The microbiological test performed on the ET tubes is not clear.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout the manuscript which needs to be corrected.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beena M S
Department, University & Country	Kerala University of Health Sciences, India