

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_119611
Title of the Manuscript:	A Clinical Trail of Silver Diamine Fluoride application on children's primary teeth to prevent dental caries progression among preschool children, Vientiane: A pilot study
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript covers a very important topic which is highly relevant to scientific community, However, it's aims and objectives are not clearly defined</p> <p>2. The manuscript title is not suitable because it says about prevention of caries but in this trial SDF is applied for caries arrest.</p> <p>3. Abstract is concise, comprehensive and covers all points.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The organisation and construction of manuscript is not up to the mark. Manuscript lacks pertinent information about the intervention.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No, there are major flaws in the manuscript writing and lot of grammatical mistakes and mistakes in proper use of tenses, are clearly evident.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The concentration of SDF used is not mentioned and justified.</p> <p>2. Randomisation method is not explained.</p> <p>3. Allocation/concealment is not done.</p> <p>4. Blinding followed in the present trial is not discussed and explained.</p> <p>5. Mechanism of action of SDF not explained.</p> <p>6. Procedure of application of SDF not elaborated.</p> <p>7. Consort guidelines are not followed and consort flow chart is not constructed.</p> <p>8. Details of statistical analysis are not discussed.</p> <p>9. Follow up duration is too short.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Zohra Jabin
Department, University & Country	Brunel University, United Kingdom