



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_40167
Title of the Manuscript:	ORAL HEALTH KNOWLEDGE AND ORAL HYGIENE PRACTICES AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN BAYELSA STATE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The data needs to presented more clearly and with appropriate statistical treatment. The presented data could be more understood if it was presented in tables and/or figures. The structure of the manuscript could be reorganized to facilitate the understanding about the manuscript. Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? This study needs ethical committee and I did not find it in this paper.	All Noted. The Chi-squared test was used to test for significant difference between the 2 categorical data tested in tables 5 and 6. The t-test in figure 1 was used to statistically assess the level of knowledge after determining proportions that had both good and poor level of knowledge. All other tables are descriptive presentations of relevant data. The essence of the manuscript was to identify if oral health knowledge and hygiene practices were affected by having dental care facilities available or not. This was done and statistically tested with appropriate conclusions provided. Ethical committee approval and ethical standards stated in paper.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors could to add more up to date references.	Noted. However, it is also noted that majority of the references used in this study are reference materials published not more than 10 years from the present date.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		