SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Dental Sciences
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJDS_62083**
Title of the Manuscript:	**ULTRASOUND GUIDED DEXTROSE PROLOTHERAPY: A PROMISING HOPE FOR TEMPOROMANDIBULAR JOINT DYSFUNCTION**
Type of the Article	**Clinical study**

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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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	This an interesting clinical study however some points needs revision; 1. Some grammatical and spelling errors must be checked 2. Statistical analysis must be included at the end of the materials and methods section with giving details. 3. Ethical approval and inform consent did not mentioned in the materials methods? 4. In table 1 p values could be included. Also generally the statistical comparisons could be shown more clearly 5. A table showing descriptive information of patients could be considered 6. An intraoperative photograph could be added showing ultrasound guidance 7. Did the authors performed a power calculation? 8. Why did di authors not consider to include a control group of patients treated with protheraphy alone (as it is a routine technique in use and not cause ethical concerns?) 9. Authors stated in discussion that Mouth opening was 45.27 preoperatively and it reduced to 41.67 after 6 month postoperative period. It is almost similar to the study of **Ungor et al** there preoperative mouth opening was 44.4 and after 4 sessions of prolotherapy was 35.1[4]. However there is an important difference among studies in terms of the reduction of mouth opening.	All the suggested corrections have been done accordingly
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* Ethical approval and inform consent did not mentioned in the materials methods?	