

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMMR_117723
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT DESENSITIZING PROTOCOLS IN IN-OFFICE DENTAL WHITENING: CLINICAL, BLIND AND RANDOMIZED STUDY
Type of the Article	Randomized clinical trial

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>)

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- This research article is important due to the excessive demand on bleaching yet a lot of hazards are inevitable, the most important hazard is teeth hypersensitivity. Moreover usage of natural products proved to be efficient in our field.</p> <p>2- Some suggestions regarding using of different desensitizing protocols, this is some how misleading. I can see clearly that ozonated sunflower oil and the time of being effective are the driving motive for this research. So why not to be obvious in the title.</p> <p>3- The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4- The manuscript is well structured</p> <p>5- The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>6- References are concise yet to the point and most of them are efficiently recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language of this manuscript is straight and clear</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The statistical analysis tables should be more concise to avoid repetition and to be more informative for the readers</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:	Mohammed Nasser Mohammed Anwar
Department, University & Country	Ain-Shams University, Egypt