

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126540
Title of the Manuscript:	The use of photobiomodulation in the treatment of long COVID xerostomia. A randomized controlled pilot clinical trial.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The significance of this manuscript lies in its exploration of the oral alterations experienced by individuals infected with COVID-19, such as xerostomia, and the lack of appropriate management strategies available. The study emphasizes the feasibility of addressing these issues through an effective, cost-efficient, and safe approach.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title chosen for the article is apt and aligns well with the content presented.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is thorough and succinct, effectively summarizing the key points of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-suited for presenting the research findings in a coherent manner.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates technical proficiency through its well-organized structure and detailed statistical analysis. The results section is lucidly outlined and supported by a robust discussion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The reference section is adequately populated with recent sources, contributing to the academic relevance of the study. A reference is needed at the end of the paragraph discussing the high heterogeneity found among studies. Please ensure an appropriate citation is included to strengthen the scholarly foundation. (highlighted in yellow)	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript is generally effective, but there are some noticeable typos that require correction as highlighted. Clarity is needed regarding the p-values cited in the footnotes of Table 4. Specifically, do these values pertain solely to salivary pH and stimulated salivary flow, or do they also consider unstimulated salivary flow? Please provide clarification on this aspect for enhanced precision.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fatima AlZahraa Al Beesh
Department, University & Country	University of Damascus, Syria