

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_113314
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between oral health of the pregnant women and low birth weight of the newborns.
Type of the Article	Research 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript addresses an important topic within the field of dental and maternal health. The relationship between oral health during pregnancy and the birth weight of newborns is a significant area of research, as it has implications for both maternal and child health outcomes. Understanding this relationship can inform preventive strategies and interventions to improve maternal oral health and reduce the risk of low birth weight in newborns. 2. The title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the main focus of the study 3. The abstract of the article provides a concise summary of the study objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. It effectively communicates the main aspects of the research to the reader. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The introduction provides background information and context for the study, the methodology section describes the research design and procedures in detail, the results section presents the findings clearly, and the discussion section interprets the results and compares them to existing literature. However, there are some minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in the writing that could be addressed to improve clarity. 5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct in terms of its methodology and analysis. The study utilized a cohort design with appropriate inclusion and exclusion criteria, and statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS. However, there are a few areas where further clarification or justification may be needed, such as the selection of specific dental criteria and the interpretation of certain results. 6. The references provided in the manuscript are relevant to the topic and include a mix of recent and older studies. However, there is room for improvement in terms of referencing more recent literature to strengthen the discussion and support the findings. Additionally, there are some inconsistencies in the citation style that should be corrected for consistency. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality of the article are acceptable for scholarly communication. However, there are some grammatical errors, inconsistencies, and awkward phrasings throughout the manuscript that could be improved upon. A thorough proofreading and editing process would enhance the clarity and professionalism of the writing, making it more suitable for publication in a scholarly journal. Additionally, ensuring consistent adherence to academic writing conventions and citation styles would further enhance the overall quality of the language in the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Yogesh Chaudhari
Department, University & Country	Mumbai University, India