

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Dental Sciences</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_95597
Title of the Manuscript:	Oil pulling; A Natural Cure to Oral Diseases
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajds.com/index.php/AJDS/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Manuscript is interesting, alternative methods of treatment and prevention should always be used. The topic is useful and can be considered innovative in the treatment of oral diseases</p> <p>In the title of the work, it is necessary to add what kind of work it is. (review work, clinical trials, A randomized prospective study, etc..)</p> <p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. It is necessary for the abstract to be clearer, to contain up to 250 words and to be structured. If the paper is original, it is necessary that the abstract contains the basic parts, introduction, methodology, results and conclusion</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically based, but explanations are missing so that the work has a scientific basis.</p> <p>References are not technically adequately arranged, references are missing for certain claims in the work.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is necessary to better explain the mechanism of applied oil and bacterial membrane. How the interaction occurs.</li> <li>How did the authors prove that there was a reduction in bacteria. Which bacteria react the most and which less. State in the paper the sentence that it is necessary to use the PCR technique in further research in order to strictly prove the quantitative reduction of bacteria.</li> <li>Which is the proposed mechanism in caries reduction?</li> <li>The authors should better explain the therapeutic length of oil use and separate the length of use into therapeutic and preventive measures.</li> <li>Whether the duration of the therapy depends on the indication or whether it is always used at the same time interval?</li> <li>The references are missing for certain claims in the paper. (This oil pulling technique is known to prevent many oral diseases such as gingivitis, halitosis, oral ulcers, dental caries, oral thrush and many more. <b>missing reference</b> ; It has high saponification index. It contains 92% saturated acids and -lauric acid making up for 50% of these saturated acids which react with alkalis present in saliva such as sodium hydroxide and bicarbonates to form sodium laurate like substances thus functioning as antimicrobial and anti-inflammatory. <b>missing reference</b></li> <li>In the review manuscript- must have a much larger number of references and mention more scientists who have dealt with this topic and explain their results.</li> </ul>	

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ivan Minic</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nis, Serbia</b>