

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJDS_122631
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of intraoperative intramuscular dexamethasone in oral surgery
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Peer Review Comments on the Manuscript "Efficacy of Intraoperative Intramuscular Dexamethasone in Oral Surgery"</p> <p>1. Title and Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title: The title appropriately reflects the content of the study but could be more specific by including the study's main outcome or the comparison with NSAIDs. • Abstract: The abstract provides a general overview of the study. However, it lacks some important details such as the study's hypothesis, statistical methods, and the significance of the results. Consider adding these to improve clarity and completeness. <p>2. Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background Information: The introduction provides a solid historical context for the use of corticosteroids, particularly dexamethasone, in medical and dental settings. However, it could be enhanced by a more detailed discussion on the specific rationale for choosing intramuscular dexamethasone in this study. • Literature Review: The review of literature is relevant but brief. A more comprehensive review could help contextualize the current study within the broader scope of existing research. Additionally, newer studies are missing that could provide additional insights. <p>3. Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Design: The study design is clear, but the description of the methods is somewhat vague. It would benefit from more specific details on how patients were selected, how the intervention was standardized, and how the outcomes were measured. • Sample Size: The sample size of 16 patients is small, which may limit the study's generalizability. A discussion on sample size calculation or justification for the chosen sample size is missing. • Data Collection and Analysis: The method of data collection is mentioned, but there is no clear explanation of the statistical methods used for data analysis. Including this information is crucial for evaluating the study's conclusions. <p>4. Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of Data: The results are presented with descriptive statistics and are supported by figures and tables. However, the text could be clearer in explaining the significance of the findings. For instance, the comparison between the dexamethasone group and the NSAID group could be more explicitly stated. • Statistical Analysis: There is no mention of the statistical significance of the results, which is a major omission. Were the differences between the groups statistically significant? If so, this should be clearly reported, along with p-values or confidence intervals. • Clinical Case: The inclusion of a single clinical case provides a practical example, but it may not be necessary in the context of the study unless it adds unique insights. If retained, it should be better integrated into the results and discussion sections. <p>5. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation of Findings: The discussion section briefly addresses the results but lacks depth in interpreting the findings within the context of existing literature. The discussion could be improved by comparing the study results with those of similar studies and exploring potential reasons for any differences. • Limitations: The manuscript does not adequately address the limitations of the study. Potential limitations such as the small sample size, short follow-up period, and potential biases should be acknowledged and discussed. • Clinical Implications: While the conclusion suggests that dexamethasone is effective, the discussion could benefit from a more detailed analysis of the clinical implications, including any potential risks or side effects associated with dexamethasone use. <p>6. Figures and Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The figures and tables are useful but could be better labeled and more clearly explained in the text. Ensure that all visual data are fully interpreted within the results and discussion sections. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>7. Ethical Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ethical approval is not explicitly mentioned in the manuscript. Ensure that the study received appropriate ethical clearance and that this is stated in the text. <p>8. Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The conclusion is consistent with the findings but is somewhat general. A more nuanced conclusion that addresses both the strengths and limitations of the study, as well as future research directions, would be beneficial.	
--	---	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rutuja G. Vidhale
Department, University & Country	D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University, India