



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_53954</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Qualitative analysis of bacterial aerosols generated during ultrasonic dental scaling.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI 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>At the result part, it is only a global analyse.</p> <p>“Table 1 Qualitative analysis of bacteria in aerosols generated during Ultrasonic scaling” is for group number?</p> <p>I want a comparison between the control group and group 1, control group and group 2, and a comparison between the group 1 and group 2</p> <p>I want a detailed statistical analysed. You need more explanation about p value.</p> <p>“It was concluded from the study that pre procedural mouth rinsing before ultrasonic scaling significantly reduces the CFU count in aerosols sample as compared to the non-rinsing side and 0.2% Chlorhexidine was found to be more effective than 5 % green tea mouth rinse in reducing bacterial load in aerosol samples.” you have a conclusion but the result for this?</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The introduction parts needs to be more focused.</p> <p>“The aim of present study was to evaluate the efficacy of two mouth rinses in reducing CFUs (bacterial load) in aerosol samples and to do the qualitative analysis of the bacterial species cultivated on blood agar plates. The study comprised of seventy patients with plaque index and gingival index score ranging between 1 and 3. Study subjects were then divided into two equal groups (group 1 and group 2) of 35. Split mouth design was used for oral prophylaxis of study subjects. Group 1 rinsed with 0.2% Chlorhexidine gluconate preprocedurally for one minute while the second group was asked to rinse with 5% green tea mouth rinse for a minute before ultrasonic scaling.” This not a conclusion. We know your study.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Written informed consent was taken from every patient. Ethical approval was obtained from ethics review committee of Ziauddin University	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mona Ionaș</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu, Romania</b>