SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Dentistry
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJRRD_41064**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of Differential Oral Cell-specific Responses to the E-cigarette Component Nicotine**
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)

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	- The objective "*…to determine the biological effects*" is broad and inespecific. What particular changes were studied? (Proliferation, Viability, etc.). Those should be **clearly** stated. - "*The working hypothesis was…*" There is evidence to back such statement? If so, it should be briefly presented in Introduction. - In M&M, *Cell viability & Proliferation and Nicotine* are assessed using different methods, but no reference is given to any of them. Are these methods validated by previous studies? Why did they were chosen? Why the nicotine doses? Changes **must** be made to explain this in detail. - [**Conclusions**] "*Finally, these data also suggest the possibility that prolonged use and administration of nicotine…*": this study assessed the effect on nicotine over a 5 day period, not nearly enough to call it **prolonged**. This should be changed.	
Minor REVISION comments	- M&M: [2.3 Cell Proliferation] "*…using Gentian Violet, as previously described.*": a proper reference should be given. - Some of the statements in the **Results** section belong to Discussion, e.g. "*For example, HGF-1 cells exhibited a nearly three-fold increase in overall cell number over the course of five days (T0 – T5), which nearly approximates the average doubling time of 48–72 hours previously observed with this cell line* "; Results is suppoused to be an objective description of facts; the place for inferences and comments belongs to Discussion.	
Optional/General comments	This is a neatly and detailed study, where the authors presents an interesting approach for a mainstream topic, the effects of vaping. However, some clarifications regarding methodology and background are needed to make this a sound research piece.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***LAZOS, Jerónimo Pablo***
Department, University & Country	***Oral Medicine Department, Dentistry College, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina***