

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRD_73836
Title of the Manuscript:	“ACCESSING DENTAL HYGIENE SERVICES IN PRICE COUNTY, WI: AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION OF QUALITY OF LIFE AND QUALITY OF CARE”
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Statistics must be definitely redone: in this form, it is unacceptable in the scientific paper. The author simply shows an increase (review of the Table), but an increase of specific time points in time series analysis should be used. Please use geometrical mean weighted by the period. Moreover, discuss the observed increase or decrease in numbers (the reasons for the observed change).</b></p> <p><b>The authors provided Table 3, but nowhere in the text discuss this Table – please revise this issue. Furthermore, what is the dental dynamics among minorities?</b></p> <p><b>Also, if you feel such a discussion is pointless, please consider rejecting minorities from the studies. It is less than 10% of the study sample</b></p> <p><b>The total of a column provided at the end of the Table is meaningless. It provides only the sum of changes observed each year, and that is it.</b></p> <p><b>In brief: Statistics need to be redone. The result section should describe the findings of the manuscript. The discussion part should review the findings against similar studies performed in other countries.</b></p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>There is no need to spell out whole numbers (especially using US standard in hundreds). Sentence "Institutional Review Board (IRB) was requested..." does not specify what was requested from the Board.</p> <p>Please use more straightforward language. Such long sentences are difficult to read and follow, especially for an international audience.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The topic is interesting, and I suggest publishing the manuscript. However, much more work needs to be done for this study to reach international research standards.</p> <p>I strongly suggest asking an author to revise the manuscript, especially statistics, and resubmit to re-evaluation.</p> <p>The paper, after changes, will confound to required scientific standards,</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Igor Z. Zubrzycki</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Radom, Poland</b>