

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_106359
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Clinical Relevance of Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Dental Surgical Procedures: a systematic review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The topic addressed in the systematic review of the manuscript, along with the scope of the stated objective and the methodology applied for this type of study, supports its relevance in contributing to knowledge for the responsible use of Antibiotic Prophylaxis in Dental Surgical Procedures. This justifies its publication given the existing gaps in Clinical Relevance and the lack of evidence of its effectiveness in preventing infection processes that may occur during an intervention or issues related to patient recovery.</p> <p>2. The title is accurate in relation with the type of manuscript. Its clarity makes it possible to identify the main topic of the content that is addressed.</p> <p>3. The developed abstract accurately and comprehensively covers all the aspects it should.</p> <p>4. The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are considered appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is supported by the scientific methodology employed for this type of studies, which underpins its findings and contributions to knowledge.</p> <p>6.- The references that support the article are sufficient and recent.</p> <p><b>Additional suggestions:</b></p> <p>1. To review the relevance of including reference 17, "The effect of preoperative clindamycin in reducing early oral implant failure: a randomised placebo-controlled clinical trial," as it does not appear to be related to the study's objective.</p> <p>2. To strengthen its conclusion, by incorporating the study's limitations, as well as recommendations for addressing associated factors in future research, such as:</p> <p>a) Patient age, b) Patient's overall health status, c) Type and timing of antibiotic administration, d) Type of dental procedure, e) Oral hygiene habits, and f) Dietary habits.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The text is written clearly and employs appropriate technical vocabulary for the fields of dentistry and medical research. Ideas are presented coherently, and suitable bibliographic references are used to support the arguments.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>María Cristina Sifuentes Valenzuela</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México</b>