



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS_IJTDH_36449
Title of the Manuscript:	Educative Intervention in the Oral Hygiene of People with Down Syndrome: A Quasi-Experimental Study
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 <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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	TO START WITH, THIS RESEARCH IS GOOD AND APT ESPECIALLY FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CARE BUT I HAVE CERTAIN ISSUES. VIZ: Line 77: Select and use the most appropriate study design which seems to be: "Quasi-experimental" based on the way the research was carried out. Line 195 and below: - There was absolutely no need in Table 1 for a test of association for the demographic variables of both control and experimental groups. Simply providing the frequency and percentage of these variables is sufficient for demographics. ASSOCIATION TESTING WOULD HAVE BEEN NECESSARY IF AN OBJECTIVE WAS TO FIND AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND OTHER STUDY VARIABLES e.g. KNOWLEDGE OF HYGIENE TECHNIQUE. - The Same Comment above Goes for Table 2 which is evident in variable: "Number of siblings; which is meant to be an integer". THE MEAN AND S.D. ARE HOWEVER SUFFICIENT FOR THE AGE VARIABLE. - To add to Table 3 (if possible), it would also be advisable to test for a statistical difference between the mean and S.D. scores of the 2 experimental groups prior to intervention and post-intervention using your t-test.	We thanks at reviewers for their time and for the comments. They make better our manuscript. Changed the order in study design. In quasi-experimental design, the groups were normally formed (not randomized), could have many bias. The comparison between groups are for to show that the groups are similar. In quasi-experimental design, the groups were normally formed (not randomized), could have many bias. The comparison between groups are for to show that the groups are similar. We design the table 5 with this data and t-test and P-values
Minor REVISION comments	Line 249: ...type of population were only two...: SHOULD BE: ...type of population, there were only two. Lines 47 and 253: "Indexes" SHOULD BE: "Indices" Line 56: ...cavity oral. SHOULD BE: "...oral cavity" Line 268: ...necessary improve the interventions... SHOULD BE: ...necessary to improve the interventions...	Corrected Corrected Corrected Corrected
Optional/General comments		