



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_19036
Title of the Manuscript:	Pilot study of photoallergic reactions to UV filters among dental professionals
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	There is information in abstract that are not in the paper What was the hypothesis of the study? The study intends to measure the incidence of photoallergic reactions, but in line 189 it was mentioned prevalence. Methods - must to be more detailed: type of study, period and local of the study, sample size, recruitment of the subjects. There is excluding criteria after table 2. General characterization of the groups would be better allocated in results section. Skin phototest patch was applied only on patients' arms? Line 50 only mention patients.	Taking into account the remarks from the other Reviewer the hypothesis is re-formulated as well as the purpose, as follows "The purpose of the present pilot study was to evaluate if there are photoallergic reactions to selected UV filters among dental professionals (dentists, nurses and attendants) and dental patients." Details about place and duration of the study are included – line 48-49. General characterization of the groups was allocated in the results section (as table 2). Phototest patches were applied on the mid upper back skin of the patients – line 54.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Results: Why the authors decided to show the difference of skin reaction related to gender? If the literature doesn't mention it, just describe it in the text. Table 3 – when result is zero, the symbol is hyphen and not the number zero. Accordingly to line 89, It should be expected reaction also before the UV exposition? The authors could express the meaning of these findings for the practice of dental professionals.	We decided to show the difference of skin reaction related to gender because of the results indicating trend (even the number of tested individuals is small) women to be with higher incidence of positive reactions of photosensitization. Table 3 is corrected according to the Reviewer's suggestion. According to the methodology for photopatch testing, we compare the manifestation of positive reactions before and after UV irradiation. This is stated in the re-formulated conclusion, according to the suggestion of the other Reviewer: "The present pilot investigation failed to demonstrate any photosensitizing effect. A slight photosensitizing action of Bis-GMA could be suggested, but the sample is too small to determine if there is a tendency to increased activity of certain ingredients"
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Ethical Issue: The study was granted by the Medical University – Sofia, Grant № 48/2014, and the Medical Ethics Board at the Medical University of Sofia. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study and gave their written informed consent. Authors mention that the study was approved by the Medical Ethics Board at the Medical University of Sofia and that participant gave their written informed consent (line 41-42)	of dental materials. Further work is needed to validate reliability.”
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		