

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101337
Title of the Manuscript:	ONE-YEAR CLINICAL EVALUATION OF FOUR DESENSITIZING AGENTS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF CERVICAL DENTIN HYPERSENSITIVITY: A RANDOMIZED, PROSPECTIVE, BLINDED CLINICAL 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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>(There are Classifications of NCCL Cervical abrasions (class A, B, C) & Sub classifications (Type 1-4) ; so they should be mentioned because DH is multi-factorial & can be originated from different surfaces.</p> <p>Sensitivity should be given in detail for evaluation of VAS Score (daily life DH, evaporative air DH, tactile DH; g-VAS).</p> <p>Amount of force with specific probe (like Yeaple probe 10-50g) for tactile sensitivity evaluation should be added. Smoking criteria should be included. Practically, maximum studies are carried out for the time span of 4-8 weeks; even there is no available data of patient evaluation beyond 3 months after the application of DDAs. In our day to day practice, we do use DDAs in mild abrasion cases where sufficient space is not available for GIC restorations. But DDAs like (CWV, 3M ESPE) are not effective that much after 3 months though the claim of effectiveness is around 18 months. For a long run, where abrasion continues, definite restorations seem to have greater edge over Ca, Po4, fluoride applications. 1 year DH evaluation (all types) of 4 types of DDAs should be unequal & gradually decreasing). DDAs are effective for short term study. In the current article, the gap of the interval 3 & 4 is higher (60 days & 360 days); no evaluation of the depth of the surface abrasion of the index teeth at final interval with the baseline measurement at the time of DDA application.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Quite good	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Well designed study	

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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nanda Kishore Ghoshal
Department, University & Country	India