

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_87582
Title of the Manuscript:	ANTIBACTERIAL EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT INTRACANAL IRRIGANTS ON ROOT CANAL TREATMENT: An In-Vitro study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Topic of high interest for potential readers of this Journal. Some comments are made in favor of improving the current version of the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Abstract. Aims.</i> Better than "seeing the effects of the different agents" would be to say "analyze or study". <i>Conclusions.</i> Do not specify results of statistical analysis (not necessary). <i>Keywords.</i> Instead of "intracanal medication", consider changing to "intra canal medication". - <i>Introduction.</i> I would be interested in explaining the meaning of the acronym "EDTA". <i>When reference is made to the Neem product, it would be interesting to limit a bibliographical citation.</i> - <i>Material and method.</i> Typographic error detected. Where it says "Cholohexidine", it should say "Chlorhexidine". Three questions arise: 1.- <i>The study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Center or Ethics Committee of reference?.</i> 2.- <i>Was a sample calculation carried out?.</i> 3.- <i>Did all patients sign informed consent? It should be specified.</i> - <i>Results and discussion:</i> It would be interesting to differentiate the two sections. On two occasions the term "Chlorohexidine" is detected, better "Chlorhexidine". Check. A paragraph or table that includes baseline characteristics of the sample is missing: ages/age range vs. mean age, sex (%), dental problem and other clinical or social characteristics. It would be interesting to know the microorganisms identified in the patients included in the study. <i>Has any association been studied/found between the nature of the microorganism and the product used?</i> - <i>Discussion.</i> Review. Except for <i>the first paragraph on page 6</i>, the rest of the paragraphs are an analysis of the different products and related studies. The discussion of the results in a scientific article corresponds to the way in which the results are interpreted by the researcher, both in light of the hypothesis raised, and in light of what other authors say. It is about elucidating what the results mean and why things happened that way. - <i>Conclusions.</i> Review. <i>Limitations</i> should be included at the end of the "Discussion" section. Limitations of the study should be specified. For example, the low number of patients included, a study of patients from a single center, not knowing the microbiological nature of the samples analyzed, etc. could be considered as limitations. Rather than "it was concluded", specify "we conclude". - <i>Tables and Figures.</i> <i>Table 1.</i> "Significance" column could be eliminated. <i>Figure 1.</i> <i>Were the microorganisms of the 4 samples that appear in this section identified?</i> It really is not a figure, but four photos. - <i>Bibliography.</i> Check. In some citations dates appear, in others the year of publication appears in parentheses. Assess whether it is possible to include more recent bibliographic citations, this is equal to or less than five years (from 2017 onwards). 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	M. Belén Alonso-Ortiz
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria , Spain