

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_121622
Title of the Manuscript:	Outcome of Azithromycin with Non-Surgical Periodontitis Therapy at Dental Hospital University of health Sciences Lao PDR.
Type of the 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

Compulsory REVISION 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 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.</p>	<p>This study has been conducted multiple times previously (scientific redundancy) so kindly keep a paragraph in the introduction emphasising on the need to republish this work.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>There must be a mention of "Doxycycline control group" in the study title kindly correct title.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Disclose number of people included in the present study and randomization and standardization of Operators ?? this is a huge flaw in clinical trials?</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Methodology – +It is a clinical trial with NO MENTION OF NUMBER OF PATIENTS?? No mention of Randomization of patients?? And No mention of Matching both groups ?? ON what bases is MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION RELEVANT ?? without these details there can not be "any reproducibility of the results" + The statistics is wrong – Paired T test is done only for a Split mouth study but this has different individuals in different groups?? The correct test is "students T test" +Spearman's corelation coefficient if found positive should have been used to write the Conclusion but the conclusion written seems pointless ??? this conclusion is given in theory in 2013. Atleast, if you found a relation you could mention something like "Azithromycin is x (spearman's relation) times more likely to reduce microbial load as compared to doxycycline as an adjunct to Non-surgical periodontal therapy" +There is also No mention of standardisation of the Operator evaluating the results – creates "BIAS" Discussion- Why is there No discussion?? It's a scientific paper ?? No discussion means No addition to science.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>+The 10th reference suggests the rationale for use of Azithromycin is Anaerobic microbes however the ideal drug for such flora is "Metronidazole" – strongly advice to "remove the word anaerobes as most culture based studies done on anaerobes are incorrect due to exposure to oxygen on sample collection itself" and only Genetic tests like PCR are effective but they don't declare when the bacteria was present – actively or passively as genetic tests show even dead organisms.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are up to date</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Adequate use of English</p>	
<p>Optional/General 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:	Siddharth Narayan
Department, University & Country	Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India