



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_59751
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF OIL PULLING AND MOUTHWASH
Type of the Article	Survey

**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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You should describe what product it was like to extract and what the composition of the oil and mouthwash was, describe the application used and the questions. As described above, it is not possible to reproduce this work considered research because the methodology is not clear. This part is necessary because of the statements in the results: From the study it is evident that the participants had very little knowledge on oil pulling. Hence it is of utmost importance to enhance the awareness on effectiveness of oil pulling. From the study it is evident that the participants had very little knowledge on oil pulling. Hence it is of utmost importance to enhance the awareness on effectiveness of oil pulling. What oil?</li> <li>- The evaluation of the study was based on the plaque index and, the research was online, so there would be no way to evaluate this step. If it is an author's description, review the grammar used.</li> <li>- In the third paragraph of the results and discussion: The clinical evaluation in this study was based on the plaque index provided by(Asokan, Emmadi and Chamundeswari, 2009) and the modified gum index provided by(Ankola, Nagesh and Amith, 2007). When informing who provided the study, it should not be in parentheses. Did these authors develop the plaque and gum index? Who are the authors? Rewrite the paragraph.</li> <li>- As you can say if the research was on line: In our study the data for the process showed a reduction in the bacterial growth but that of the mouthwash data showed more significant result at an instant thus mouth was is more preferable among the subject, but further studies showed that the regular use of oil pulling over mouth was significantly beneficial. The online study allows to evaluate the participants' information and the data observed in the literature review. Informants cannot report a reduction in bacterial growth because this is a professional assessment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Article of academic interest regarding the proposal but does not fit into relevant research due to more information from the study application with monkeys and questions from the answered questionnaire. It also lacked clarification about the composition of the compared products.	

**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>Fátima Heritier Corvalan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil</b>