

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Sri Oktawati, Citra, Hasanuddin, Dian, Sitti Raodah , andi nurul ilmi:

Your submission EFFICACY OF SALINE OR SALT-BASED SOLUTION MOUTHRINSE IN IMPROVING PERIODONTAL HEALTH : A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely, BDS

Major reviews

Dear Author,

I appreciate the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled “EFFICACY OF SALINE OR SALT-BASED SOLUTION MOUTHRINSE IN IMPROVING PERIODONTAL HEALTH: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.” The topic is relevant and timely, particularly in

light of the ongoing search for alternatives to traditional antiseptics in the control of dental biofilm and gingival inflammation that may present fewer adverse effects.

Please find below some comments and observations:

Abstract:

- Line 4 – The word systematically is misspelled.
- Results: The statement “All included studies reported saline or salt-based solution rinses successfully decreased the plaque index, gingival index, bleeding on probing, and probing depth” should be revised, as in Table II, page 9, the study by Hoover et al. (2017) reported non-effective results.

Materials and Methods:

- Quality assessment: The manuscript does not specify which types of bias were assessed in the included studies or how this classification was performed. For example, “the assessment included bias due to missing

data, bias in the measurement of outcomes, and bias in the selection of the reported result. Each study was then assigned an overall risk of bias rating categorized as low risk, moderate risk, serious risk, or critical risk, as per ROBINS-I.”

- Additionally, the use of a tool such as GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) would be appropriate to assess the overall quality of evidence based on the risk of bias.

Results:

- The results of the quality assessment were not reported. How were the biases of the included studies classified? A figure would help illustrate this information clearly.

Discussion:

- Please include in the discussion whether the included studies presented low, moderate, or high risk of bias, as this may impact the interpretation of the findings.
- On page 16, in the sentence “Nonetheless, the overall direction of evidence supports the safe, effective, and economical role of salt-based rinses as part of a broader periodontal care strategy,” there is a lack of a tool to assess the quality of evidence and thereby strengthen this conclusion.

In conclusion, I reiterate that the manuscript has potential for publication. I hope these comments assist in improving the quality and clarity of the work.

Sincerely,

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Sri Oktawati, Citra, Hasanuddin, Dian, Sitti Raodah , andi nurul ilmi:

Your submission EFFICACY OF SALINE OR SALT-BASED SOLUTION MOUTHRINSE IN IMPROVING PERIODONTAL HEALTH : A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW to Brazilian Dental Science, has been revised and according to reviewers' comments, there are questions to be addressed and/or points to be clarified/corrected.

Please answer the reviewers considerations point-by-point in a separate document and also please make all the corrections in the text highlighted in yellow.

Deadline: 30 days

Thank you for considering Brazilian Dental Science for publishing your research. We are looking forward the revised version of you manuscript.

Sincerely,

Major revisions:

The topic is pertinent and timely. However, a significant gap is observed regarding the qualitative assessment, which is essential for characterizing a systematic review, both in the methodological description and in the presentation of results.

In methodology, the specific types of biases assessed in the included studies are not clearly identified. In the results section, neither the individual risk of bias nor the overall risk of the included studies is presented. Consequently, when the authors conclude that saline or salt-based mouthrinses constitute an effective alternative to conventional antiseptics, it becomes evident that, despite the use of

the ROBINS-I tool to assess study quality, the evaluation process and the resulting ratings were neither described nor discussed. Some studies have small sample sizes or are part of larger studies; therefore, reporting the bias assessment would make the quality of each study clearer. Including figures summarizing these findings would also enhance clarity.

Furthermore, there is no mention of a tool such as GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation), for instance, to assess the quality and strength of the evidence, which could influence the interpretation of the results.

This limitation undermines the ability to assess the robustness of the association and to determine whether saline or salt-based mouthrinses truly contribute to improving periodontal health outcomes.

Therefore, it is recommended that the article report the qualitative assessment and corresponding results of the studies included in the systematic review, in order to substantiate the level of evidence supporting the assertion that saline and salt-based mouthrinses represent effective alternatives for the control of periodontal pathogens.

Reviewer 2

I appreciate the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled “EFFICACY OF SALINE OR SALT-BASED SOLUTION MOUTHRINSE IN IMPROVING PERIODONTAL HEALTH: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW.” The topic is relevant and timely, particularly in

light of the ongoing search for alternatives to traditional antiseptics in the control of dental biofilm and gingival inflammation that may present fewer adverse effects.

Please find below some comments and observations:

Abstract:

- Line 4 – The word systematically is misspelled.
- Results: The statement “All included studies reported saline or salt-based solution rinses successfully decreased the plaque index, gingival index, bleeding on probing, and probing depth” should be revised, as in Table II, page 9, the study by Hoover et al. (2017) reported non-effective results.

Materials and Methods:

- Quality assessment: The manuscript does not specify which types of bias were assessed in the included studies or how this classification was performed. For example, “the assessment included bias due to missing

data, bias in the measurement of outcomes, and bias in the selection of the reported result. Each study was then assigned an overall risk of bias rating categorized as low risk, moderate risk, serious risk, or critical risk, as per ROBINS-I.”

- Additionally, the use of a tool such as GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation) would be appropriate to assess the overall quality of evidence based on the risk of bias.

Results:

- The results of the quality assessment were not reported. How were the biases of the included studies classified? A figure would help illustrate this information clearly.

Discussion:

- Please include in the discussion whether the included studies presented low, moderate, or high risk of bias, as this may impact the interpretation of the findings.

- On page 16, in the sentence “Nonetheless, the overall direction of evidence supports the safe, effective, and economical role of salt-based rinses as part of a broader periodontal care strategy,” there is a lack of a tool to assess the quality of evidence and thereby strengthen this conclusion.

In conclusion, I reiterate that the manuscript has potential for publication. I hope these comments assist in improving the quality and clarity of the work.

Sincerely,