



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJAST_10119
Title of the Manuscript:	Effectiveness of low-flow high-ozone concentration disinfection of dental impressions: A comparative study to immersion disinfection
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	*Parts of the prototype ozone disinfection device need to be clearly indicated on figure 1. *Line 105: it is mentioned after treatment with liquid disinfection solution but not mentioned to which discs it has been applied??	*Parts of the prototype ozone disinfection device have been clearly indicated on figure 1 and mentioned in the legend. *The following wording has been added: "After treatment of sample A with liquid disinfectant solution..."
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 106-108: in my opinion those 3 lines need rephrasing so that they become easier for understanding; at one point it is mentioned in line 106 'differ significantly' then in line 108 'no significant difference'!	Lines 106-108 have been rephrased as follows: "In the case of the samples inoculated with <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>, the bacterial densities of the controls (C, C+) differ significantly compared to the various ozone exposure interval samples (O₃-3, O₃-5, O₃-10, O₃-15) and the immersion disinfected sample (A) (p<0.05), while there is no significant difference between the bacterial density of the control (C) and the bacterial density of the control (C+)."
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Sample size need to be increased, preferably to include different impression materials.	A larger study has already been initiated.