

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript addresses a significant health issue—xerostomia in long COVID patients—by exploring photobiomodulation (PBM) as a potential treatment. Considering the lingering and complex effects of COVID-19, this study is timely and relevant, potentially providing a non-invasive therapeutic approach for a condition that can severely impact oral health and quality of life	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	An alternative title could be: "Exploring Photobiomodulation Therapy for Long COVID Xerostomia: A Randomized Controlled Pilot Trial."	
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 provides a clear overview of the study's aims, methodology, and key findings. However, it would benefit from a more detailed mention of the limitations encountered, such as the small sample size and unblinding issues, which may have influenced the outcomes. Additionally, emphasizing the lack of significant results for primary outcomes in both the PBM and placebo groups would provide a more balanced perspective.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, with clearly defined sections for the introduction, methodology, results, and discussion. Each section flows logically, contributing to the manuscript's readability and coherence. However, some sub-sections, particularly in the results, could benefit from additional breakdowns for improved clarity.	
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 study appears scientifically sound, with a rigorous methodology that includes randomization, control, and double-blinding to reduce bias. The use of standardized assessment tools, such as OHIP-14 and XI scales, supports the reliability of the findings. However, the small sample size and the partial unblinding of participants could have affected the statistical power, limiting the generalizability of the results. Despite these limitations, the study offers valuable preliminary insights into PBM as an adjunct therapy for long COVID-related xerostomia, which warrants further investigation with larger sample sizes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are recent and relevant, with multiple studies addressing PBM and xerostomia. However, incorporating additional references on the pathophysiology of xerostomia in COVID-19 or on the biochemistry of saliva in xerostomia cases could provide more context.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is generally well-written, but there are minor grammatical errors and sentence structure issues, particularly in the results and discussion sections. A thorough proofreading is recommended.	
Optional/General comments	This pilot study provides a strong foundation for future research into PBM's therapeutic potential for xerostomia associated with long COVID. Expanding the sample size, incorporating biochemical assessments, and exploring intraoral PBM stimulation could provide a more comprehensive understanding of PBM's effects on xerostomia symptoms and patient quality of life.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohanadoss Ponraj
Department, University & Country	The Copperbelt University, Zambia