

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82993
Title of the Manuscript:	A randomized clinical trial of clinical success and acceptability of the Hall Technique and RMGIC restorations in sealing carious primary molars.
Type of the 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.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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is very lengthy. It needs to be condensed and presented in a concise manner. 2. In the Introduction- "In India, the prevalence of dental caries in 5-, 12- and 15-year-old children is reportedly 51.9, 53.8 and 63.1 percent respectively, with a high level of untreated caries[2]." The survey here referred is of 2002-2003 which is no longer reliable after 10 years. Recent surveys needs to be referred. 3. Many of the studies referred to as recent ones in the introduction are actually 6-10 year old ones Eg. Sentences with references 8,9,15,17. Either recent studies have to be quoted or the sentences needs to be reframed. 4. Kindly clarify the objective given in the introduction. "study was planned with the objective of assessing and comparing the acceptability and clinical success of two different caries excavation techniques and two dissimilar ..."Are there any excavation techniques under study here? 5. Frankl behavior rating scale as a measure of acceptability by the child seems inappropriate. It is the scale that gives the rating of childs' innate behavior. The acceptability of the child to the procedure should have been better observed by a 3rd person, apart from the operator. 6. Figure 2 is not given. 7. Please clarify this sentence given in results "Here, parents rated both interventions (Likert score) depending on the child's response to treatment, their preference for technique used, the quality (longevity) of restoration and its color." It is not mentioned 'When' was the parents response collected. If it was at the time of placement, how can they comment on the longevity of the restoration. 8. Kindly clarify about this sentence in results "We observed six minor failures in Group A (4%) at 3- and 9-month follow-up. These patients reported of mild occasional pain in the Hall PMC tooth. This failure category was discovered in the follow-ups. It was experienced once in the day or after eating some hard food which lasted for few minutes and never recurred." But this finding is NOT represented either in Table 2, or in Figure 6 and 7. 9. "In this study, intention to treat analysis was not performed. The usual drop-out reason is children moving out of the study area." These sentences of results are not clear. Please clarify. 10. "During the 15-month follow-up, 13% (18 teeth) 'Major' failures were recorded. It included 1% in Group A at 9 months, failure category was abscess (n = 1). 12% (17 teeth) in Group B, at failure times 3 (n = 1),6 (n = 1), 12 (n = 7) and 15 months (n = 2). The failure categories were secondary caries (n = 2) and new caries (n = 15)." This description of results is not matching with the representation in Figure 6. Please make it clear. 11. Please justify the reason for choosing PMC for 64 in Figure 8 as root resorption is seen in its radiograph and on the contralateral side, 54 wis seen missing and 14 already erupting. 12. Validate this sentence of Conclusion "In our study, at the 12-month follow-up the HT outperformed RMGIC restorations. However, at 15-month follow-up, the HT and RMGIC restorations success rates were comparable" None of the data that was presented seem to be supporting this statement, of a comparable performance at 15 months. And please elaborate- what could be the reason for it. 	

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Grammatical errors need to be corrected.2. ICDAS should be represented as a two digit score.3. In Abstract- results last line "Children, parents, and the operator preferred the Hall Technique, which was statistically significant ($p < 0/001$).” Did you mean $P < 0.001$4. Please clarify why the number of subjects was 73 in Hall Technique and only 67 in RMGIC.5. In Methodolgy "Both descriptive and interferential statistics were used for measurement of variables” Did you mean Inferential statistics? Please check the spelling.	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The title could be modified to prevent the repetition of the word "Clinical"	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beena M S
Department, University & Country	Kerala University of Health Sciences, India