

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_120444
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of non-thermal atmospheric plasma on S. mutans biofilms
Type of the Article	Original Study

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://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

<u>Compulsory REVISION</u> comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>1. The article present an innovative solution to a significant problem in the field. 2. The Experimental design and results are sound, but the discussion section requires more depth and analysis. 3. The literature review of the article is comprehensive, but the authors need to clarify how their work builds upon and advances the existing knowledge in the field. 4. The authors have made a valuable contribution to the literature, but the writings need improvement for better clarity and readability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>From my prospective the mentioned title is suitable for publication in "Archives of Current Research International" journal.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and well structured, but in methodology part "Biofilms of <i>Streptococcus mutans</i> UA159 were formed on human enamel slabs submitted to episodes of sucrose exposure for 5 days and were submitted to daily treatment or one time treatment of the biofilms" this sentence requires reframing</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript is suitable for publication.</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript presents a rigorous investigation into the impact of NTAP on the S. Mutans biofilm. From the technical aspect the study is impressive, with its experimental approach, robust data analysis and interpretation of the result. Overall, this work provide valuable insights into the potential of NTAP as a novel strategy for combating S.Mutans biofilm.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :-</p>	<p>"An estimated number of more than 700 bacterial species were found within the oral biofilm" kindly add the reference for this. "In addition, it is the most common noncommunicable disease worldwide, according to the [3]". Kindly re frame the sentence or write the authors name of the cited article.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article can be improved.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pinki Gupta
Department, University & Country	IDST Dental College, India