

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78365
Title of the Manuscript:	THE EFFECT OF DENTAL CARE DURING ORTHODONTIC TREATMENT: SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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>The suitable dental cares greatly influence the outcomes and complications of orthodontic treatment. In this manuscript, the authors performed using their search strategies to find out 9 articles, describing the relation between orthodontic treatment and dental care in different countries. Herein, the "orthodontic care", the "dental care with manual toothbrushes", the "periodontal health", the "oral and periodontal hygiene", the "orthodontic treatment complications", the "orthodontic associated-dental caries", and the "Plaque, caries level and oral hygiene habits" with regard to different stages of orthodontic treatment were selected and included in the author's analysis. This is the first review which aimed to review the effect of dental care during orthodontic treatment.</p> <p>Though the topic of dental care in orthodontic treatment is new, serious concerns raised during the review process that influenced my decision to suggest rejection.</p> <p>(1) Since one of the major keywords is the dental care, throughout the manuscript the identify of dental care is confusing and imprecise, including but not limited to the incomplete reporting in Introduction, Materials & Methods, and the discussion. Most of the author's search terms were related to the "complications". Thus, the conclusion was related to the complications but not dental care.</p> <p>(2) The problems to be addressed by the review should be specified in the form of clear, unambiguous questions before beginning the review work. In the introduction section, the author addressed several complications which may occurred during orthodontic treatment. But it's extremely confusing that what the research questions are "complications: or: dental care"? Besides, the components of the research question for a system review usually includes the populations, the interventions, the outcomes and the study design.</p> <p>(3) The study selection criteria should follow directly from the review questions, latter of which was unclear. For a more refined quality assessment of selected studies, checklists should be developed which consider the generic issues relevant to the study design aspects of the review question. Here, the Table 1 showed several lines of unnecessary information about the "YEAR OF PUBLICATION, JOURNAL'S NAME, STUDY TITLE", but ignored the important information of individual preselected paper: quality assessment of the included paper.</p> <p>(4) The author did not conduct to examine for the risk of publication and related biases. If feasible, an analysis should be undertaken to explore for the risk of publication and related biases which used for the topic: dental care during orthodontic treatment.</p> <p>(5) Another serious concern is the limited interpreting of the findings presented. The findings were associated the "possible complications reported during and after the orthodontic treatment", but not "dental care".</p> <p>(6) In the discussion part, the author lists some kind of methods of "dental cares" which were used by patients and doctors, which is exactly associated to the search topic. However, this should be the main search strategies and quality assessment part of the review according to the title.</p> <p>(7) Abbreviations should only contain the words which was used for more than one time (e.g., DMFS) and contains incomplete explanations. Moreover, the DMFS was included based on the preselected articles, but has a more detailed assessment of the selected term "DMFS" been carried out?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	(8) The English language should be revised. Additionally, the grammar mistakes should be corrected.	
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:	Jiawen Yong
Department, University & Country	Justus Liebig University Giessen, Germany