

Comparative evaluation of Chloroquick with Triphala, sodium hypochlorite, and ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid on the microhardness of root canal dentin: An in vitro study

Vaishnavi Erika, Divya Kunam, Lavanya Anumula, Suneel kumar Chinni, Kiranmayi Govula

Corresponding author
Divya Kunam Narayana
Dental College and Hospital, Chintareddypalem, Nellore

Handling editor:
Michal Heger
Department of Pharmaceutics, Utrecht University, the Netherlands
Department of Pharmaceutics, Jiaxing University Medical College, Zhejiang, China

Reviewer timeline:

Received: 20 June, 2020
Editorial decision: 21 September, 2020
Revision received: 16 October, 2020
Editorial decision: 21 October, 2020
Published online: 21 January, 2021

1st Editorial decision
21-Sept-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00060
Comparative evaluation of Chloroquick with Triphala, sodium hypochlorite, and EDTA on the microhardness of root canal dentin: an in vitro study
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear Dr. Kunam,

Reviewers have now commented on your paper. You will see that they are advising that you revise your manuscript. If you are prepared to undertake the work required, I would be pleased to reconsider my decision.

For your guidance, reviewers' comments are appended below and attached to this email. Please ensure that the revision is resubmitted after thorough language editing in line with our author guidelines. The manuscript cannot be accepted when the text does not meet international standards linguistically. Please contact the editorial office if you have problems with the language editing.

If you decide to revise the work, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point which is being raised when you submit the revised manuscript. Also, please ensure that the track changes function is switched on when implementing the revisions. This enables the reviewers to rapidly verify all changes made.

Your revision is due by Oct 21, 2020.

To submit a revision, go to <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jctres/> and log in as an Author. You will see a menu item call Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: Dear Authors!

Thank you for having submitted our valuable research to this journal.

Congratulations on having addressed such an important topic.

The only issue I have to address is to ask you to reread the paper, make corrections and allow for native speaking language editing.

Reviewer #2: Every day, new products and technologies are released in the industry and it's our obligation as dentistry professionals and scientists to evaluate these products in order to make sure that they are all really effective and also safe for our patients. For the courage to work on that, I would like to congratulate the authors for the effort and the dedication.

The Microhardness evaluation is very relevant, once plays an important role on the success and specially duration of root canal treatments, making the test of new products even more important.

You would be able to access my personal review as a scientist, practioner and enthusiast of the new technologies as soon as they are effective and safe. My review is based on the literature found and personal experience and include some suggestions that I believe that can help to make a great work even better.

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.

Authors' response

Title: **Comparative evaluation of Chloroquick with Triphala, Sodium hypochlorite, and EDTA on the microhardness of root canal dentin: an in vitro study**

Reviewer # 1:

The study was thoroughly checked for grammatical errors and revised accordingly.

Reviewer # 2:

Abstract:

1. In page 1 line 21, the authors use the abbreviation or initials EDTA for the first time in the text. I suggest using the meaning of the abbreviation right after it once is the first time it appears on text.
 - A. In page 1 line 24, EDTA was spelled with abbreviation meaning for its first appearance in the revised manuscript.

2. In page 1 line 26, I suggest the removal of that sentence once in a quick search I found a paper from March/2020 where the authors evaluated the microhardness after the use of the same product (Chloroquick).
 - A. In page 1, the Phrase was removed in accordance with the recent study on Chloroquick.

3. In page 1 line 34, I suggest the use of the EDTA abbreviation with or without the abbreviation meaning, for a better understanding of the reader.
 - A. In page1 line 24, EDTA was spelled with abbreviation after its first time use with meaning and the whole manuscript was revised for the same.

4. In general, the abstract reflects what the manuscript is but in my opinion with too much words, making it too long. It has around 50 lines. I would suggest around 25.
 - A. In page 1 line 10-44 & page 2 line 6-23, abstract was concised.

Introduction:

1. In page 2 line 41, the proper way to write Naocl is NaOCL. Review the full text.
 - A. In page 3 line 19, Sodium hypochlorite was corrected as NaOCL and the study was revised for the same.

2. In page 3 line 39, the same phrase about no studies made with the Chloroquick appears. I suggest the removal again because of the same reason above.
 - A. In page 3, the sentence stated no studies evaluating effect of Chloroquick on microhardness was removed in accordance with the recent study published in the year 2020.

Methods:

1. I suggest the use of images of some steps, in order to make it even easier to understand.
- A. In page 15 & 16, in vitro study images were attached in the revised Manuscript (Fig 1, Fig 2, Fig 3, Fig 4).

Results:

1. In the Results, the first thing that brought my attention was the fact that the control group (Saline) in table 1 showed p value: $<0,001$. That data shows a significative difference in Pre and Post irrigation microhardness with Saline.
- A. In page 7 line 32-33, there was a typing mistake, and it was corrected in the revised manuscript that, there is no difference in the pre and post microhardness values for the saline group i.e $p = 0.447$.
2. I suggest a complete review on the way the results are described, to make it clearer for the reader.
- A. In page 7 line 6-53, study data results were described in a better way in the revised manuscript.

Discussion:

1. I suggest another round of references search in order to make your discussion even better and modern.
- A. In page 9 line 19, 20, 36, 52 & page 10 line 29-39, recent studies were added in the discussion part.

Conclusion

1. There is no conclusion section on the version of the manuscript I received
- A. In page 10 line 51-59, Conclusion section was added in the manuscript.

References:

1. As I mentioned above, I miss more recent studies on the references.
 - A. In page 12, 13 & 14, recent studies were included in the references no- 14, 15, 17, 21, 25, 27.
 2. The reference number 12 has no date or its not clear what is the date of the publication.
 - A. In page 12 line 34, date and year of publication was added for reference no-12.
-

2nd Editorial decision
21-Oct-2020

Ref.: Ms. No. JCTRes-D-20-00060R1
Comparative evaluation of Chloroquick with Triphala, Sodium hypochlorite, and EDTA on the microhardness of root canal dentin: an in vitro study
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Dear authors,

I am pleased to inform you that your manuscript has been accepted for publication in the Journal of Clinical and Translational Research.

You will receive the proofs of your article shortly, which we kindly ask you to thoroughly review for any errors.

Thank you for submitting your work to JCTR.

Kindest regards,

Michal Heger
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Clinical and Translational Research

Comments from the editors and reviewers:

Reviewer #2: I just would like to thank you for the considerations and accepting my review suggestions.