

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_130356
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Tooth Bleaching with 35% and 6% Hydrogen Peroxide in Primary Dentition: Study Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant gap in pediatric dentistry by exploring the efficacy and safety of high (35%) and low (6%) hydrogen peroxide concentrations for bleaching primary teeth. Its findings have the potential to establish new, evidence-based guidelines for dental bleaching in young patients, prioritizing both effectiveness and safety. The study also contributes to the broader conversation about minimally invasive, patient-friendly aesthetic treatments, offering clinical value to practitioners worldwide. It is especially timely given the growing demand for safer alternatives in aesthetic dentistry, highlighting the manuscript’s relevance to advancing pediatric dental care standards.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it is concise and clearly conveys the scope and focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is generally comprehensive but could benefit from emphasizing the long-term clinical implications of the findings, particularly regarding the stability of color change and recurrence of tooth sensitivity. Adding a brief statement about sample size and evaluation intervals will further enhance clarity.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology, including the randomization process, validated assessment tools, and adherence to ethical guidelines, is robust. However, the discussion section would benefit from deeper analysis, including mechanistic explanations and comparisons with existing literature	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and cover recent studies. However, including a systematic review on low-concentration hydrogen peroxide in pediatric dentistry may provide additional context.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and precise but could be simplified in sections of the introduction to improve accessibility for non-specialist readers. Avoid redundancies, such as repeated historical context about dental bleaching	
Optional/General comments	<p>This manuscript has the potential to become a key reference for pediatric dentistry. Future studies should consider broader age ranges, long-term follow-ups, and the inclusion of additional qualitative data (e.g., parental feedback) to build on these findings</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically sound and has significant clinical implications. Minor revisions in the abstract, discussion, and language will enhance its clarity and impact.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Study Design and Population<ul style="list-style-type: none">Age Range and Sample Size: The age range of 3–6 years may not fully capture the diversity of primary tooth discoloration etiologies. A broader age range (e.g., 3–10 years) or inclusion of more participants could provide more generalizable findings.Tooth Selection: While the use of upper canines as a reference for color assessment is justified, including multiple tooth types (e.g., incisors) could strengthen the study's applicability.Discussion and Literature Integration<ul style="list-style-type: none">Limited Contextualization: The discussion section could better contextualize findings by referencing similar studies in pediatric populations, particularly those involving low-concentration bleaching agents.Mechanistic Insights: The article lacks detailed discussion on the mechanisms by which low-concentration hydrogen peroxide achieves similar efficacy to higher concentrations, which would provide a deeper understanding of the process.Focus on Sensitivity Assessment<ul style="list-style-type: none">The reliance on the Wong-Baker FACES® Pain Scale, while child-friendly, may not fully capture nuanced differences in sensitivity. Combining this with physiological measures (e.g., pulp testing) could enhance the robustness of sensitivity data.Long-Term Outcomes<ul style="list-style-type: none">The study lacks information on follow-up beyond four weeks. Longer-term evaluations of color stability and sensitivity recurrence would provide a more comprehensive understanding of treatment outcomes.Practical Considerations<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cost Analysis: The discussion could include an analysis of cost differences between the two bleaching protocols, which is vital for decision-making in clinical settings.Parental and Child Perspectives: Including qualitative data (e.g., parental satisfaction, child comfort) would add valuable insights to the quantitative findings.Language and Structure<ul style="list-style-type: none">Technical Language: While the article is scientifically rigorous, some sections, particularly the introduction, use overly technical language that may be difficult for non-specialist readers to follow.Redundancy: Certain points, such as the historical context of dental bleaching, are repeated unnecessarily, which detracts from the article's conciseness. <p>Recommendations for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Expand Study Scope: Broaden the study population to include a wider age range and more diverse tooth types, enhancing the generalizability of findings.Deepen Analysis: Incorporate additional sensitivity assessment methods and mechanistic explanations for bleaching effectiveness.Extend Follow-Up: Conduct long-term follow-ups to evaluate color stability, patient safety, and sensitivity recurrence.Add Practical Insights: Include cost-benefit analyses and qualitative data to provide a holistic view of treatment outcomes.Refine Writing Style: Simplify technical language and eliminate redundancies to improve readability and engagement.	

Review Form 3

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sukanya Nagfernandes
Department, University & Country	USA