

Manuscript: **“The Impact of Dental Hypersensitivity on the Patients Quality of Life. A Questionnaire-Based study”**

Submitted: 21 February 2022

Accepted: 12 March 2022

Published: 30 April 2022

Corresponding Author: **Oana Elena Stoica**

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p131](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2022.v18n14p131)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Gherbon Adriana

Reviewer 2: Mihai Pop

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Dr. Gherbon Adriana	
University/Country: University of Medicine and Pharmacy V. Babes Timisoara, Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.02.2022	Date Review Report Submitted: 05.03. 2022
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Dental Hypersensitivity Over the Patients Life Quality Study Based on a Questionnaire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0310/2022	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes/No Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3

<i>Please write how were choose the patient, the inclusion and exclusion criteria in methods section. Was the questionnaire a validated one?</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>The study methods are explained clearly.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>The results are clear and do not contain errors.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Mihai Pop	
University/Country: George Emil Palade University of Medicine, Pharmacy, Science, and Technology of Targu Mures/Romania	
Date Manuscript Received: 2022.25.02	Date Review Report Submitted: 2022.03.07
Manuscript Title: The Impact of Dental Hypersensitivity Over the Patients Life Quality. Study Based on a Questionnaire	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 0310/22	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>I suggest rephrasing the title to “The impact of dental hypersensitivity on the patients’ quality of life. A questionnaire-based study”</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
<i>Well structured and clearly summarizing how the research was carried out.</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>In the penultimate paragraph of the Introduction replace “dentures” with “teeth” In the last paragraph of the Introduction replace “toothmoos” with “toothmousse” In the last paragraph of the Introduction instead of “appearance”, “incidence” would be more appropriate In the first paragraph of the Discussion replace “female sex” with “female gender” In the first paragraph of the Conclusions correct “adres” with “address”</i>	

<i>The last sentence of the first paragraph of the Conclusion is not clear. A word seems to be missing after “enamel”</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>Methods are described in sufficient detail.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
<i>All relevant findings are included</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
<i>It is described how the results fit into the dental clinical science</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation):

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: