



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJMMR_24767
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP OF PARENTAL KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE WITH ORAL HEALTH STATUS OF CHILDREN IN KARACHI
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Authors do not report approved in committee ethics</p> <p>Ask the authors refer all the references presented in accordance with the journal's standards, within the text (eg line 185) and in Item References (lines 264 onwards)</p> <p>I suggest synthesize the Introduction, that brings repeated ideas (eg lines 42 and 47-48) and comments that could appear in the Discussion</p> <p>I suggest synthesize and modify the presentation of the study's principal goal at the end of the Introduction (lines 82-85)</p> <p>I suggest the authors identify the country of carrying out the study and characterize the school where the study was done (school size, which represents the city). Present parental income in local currency but also in US dollars to facilitate international reading. Similarly the educational level indicate the years of schooling at a given level.</p> <p>using the chi-squared test over the results that could justify the discussion presented on socioeconomic level and education and its influence on oral health habits was not identified.</p> <p>What does B / w?</p> <p>Discussion on the item suggest reducing repetition of information already contained</p>	<p>The authors declare that the research was approved by Ethical Review Committee of Bahria University. The statement of ethics is attached herewith. The research was questionnaire based and did not pose any harm to subjects.</p> <p>References edited according to journal's guidelines</p> <p>Introduction has been justified and study goals resynthesized.</p> <p>Parental income has been reported in equivalent US dollars. Education level is represented in years of education at given level.</p> <p>Chi-square test performed and relation with Education and socioeconomic level justified in discussion. No significant relation was seen with socioeconomic status that's why it was not included in discussion.</p> <p>We do not understand what does the reviewer mean by b/w ?</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>in the results item. How to limit the authors indicate the sample size, but the reader does not have dimension than the 200 cases represent at school or among children enrolled in the city of study. Not also know the nature of school (public or private for example). The authors show how to limit the gap between knowing and doing, but it would not be a major achievement to discuss and not a limit?</p>	<p>Repetition of result is avoided while revising the manuscript</p> <p>Limitations edited.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Ethical issue: Authors do not report approved in committee ethics</p>	<p>The authors declare that the research was approved by Ethical Review Committee of Bahria University. The statement of ethics is attached</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Remove the numerous subitens in Results and Discussion</p>	<p>Subitens removed</p>