

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_126478
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness and Comparison of Different Behaviour Guidance Techniques in Pediatric Dental Patients- A Randomized Control Study
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>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 is important for the scientific community as it addresses a significant gap in pediatric dentistry by focusing on behavior management techniques (BMTs) for children with disabilities. The study's findings can inform clinical practices and improve dental care for this vulnerable population. I like this manuscript because it provides comprehensive data and insights into effective BMTs, which can lead to better dental experiences and outcomes for children with disabilities.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is suitable as it clearly reflects the study's focus on behavior management techniques in pediatric dentistry. However, a more specific title could be: "Comparative Effectiveness of Behavior Management Techniques in Reducing Anxiety in Pediatric Dental Patients with Disabilities."	
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 is comprehensive but could benefit from a brief mention of the key findings and their implications. Adding a sentence or two about the significant reduction in anxiety levels observed with VR distraction compared to TSD would enhance the abstract's completeness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. Each section logically follows the previous one, making the manuscript easy to follow and understand.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology is clearly described, and the use of validated scales for measuring anxiety adds to the study's reliability. The statistical analysis is thorough, and the results are well-supported by the data. The discussion effectively contextualizes the findings within the existing literature, highlighting the study's contributions and limitations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent, covering relevant studies and guidelines. No additional references are necessary at this time.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sentences in the manuscript could be refined for better readability and flow.</li> </ul> <p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications, though moderate editing for clarity and flow is recommended.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### 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:	Mohsen Sharif Zadeh Ardakani
Department, University & Country	Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran