Brazilian Dental Science

Subject: [BDS] Editor Decision

Dear Clarissa Carvalho Martins Maciel, Bianca Aparecida dos Santos, Antonio Oliveira Melo, Letícia Cavassini Torquato, Eduardo Antonio Chelin Suárez, Maria Aparecida Neves Jardini, Toshiyuki Nakatsuka, Emanuel da Silva Rovai, Andrea Carvalho De Marco:

Your submission Clinical effectiveness of full-mouth scaling combined with S-PRG particle for non-surgical treatment of stage III and IV periodontitis: randomized controlled clinical pilot study with a 3-month follow-up. 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,

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

Brazilian Dental Science

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

No

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

No

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

No

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Brazilian Dental Science

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).

NONE

Rating

Interest*

Good

Quality

Good

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Major Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

Brazilian Dental Science

Dear Authors,
Thank you for the opportunity to review this pilot study. The translational concept (an ion releasing bioactive adjuvant for non surgical periodontal therapy in stage III/IV periodontitis) is original and clinically interesting, and the early stage of the work is appreciated. The comments below are offered constructively, with the aim of aligning what the design supports with what the manuscript currently claims.
1. Adapt the study to follow CONSORT 2025.

2. The manuscript is presented as a pilot study, but the summary, results, and conclusion advance claims of efficacy ("promising results," "improvement in quality of life") based on six participants per arm. We suggest substantially moderating the language and avoiding the term "effectiveness."

3. Statistical inference with n=6 per arm makes normality impossible reliably, which limits the adequacy of the t test, for example. We suggest reporting effect sizes with confidence intervals as the primary summary.

4. The Methods state that "the primary outcome was analyzed according to periodontal pocket stratification criteria," but the primary outcome itself is not explicitly named. The summary and conclusion, however, foreground bleeding on probing and OHIP-14, which appear to be secondary. We recommend (a) explicitly stating a single primary outcome consistent with trial registration (ReBEC RBR-7k87ynr), (b) reporting that outcome prominently, independently of the outcome, and (c) presenting secondary outcomes as such, with a hierarchy of hypotheses that matches the registered protocol.

5. The conclusion that "only the SFM+S-PRG group showed an improvement in quality of life" is based on a paired test within the group, and not on a comparison between groups. To attribute improvement to adjuvant, the appropriate analysis would compare change scores between groups. The current finding describes a within-group change that may also have occurred in the comparator, with lower magnitude or subthreshold significance. We recommend reformulating this finding.

6. No a priori sample size justification is provided. A feasibility study should still declare what parameters it aims to estimate (for example, recruitment rate, between group standard deviation, dropout rate) to inform the planned definitive

trial. The criteria that determined the pilot subset of 12 and the stopping point should be explained.

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

Questionnaire

Does the manuscript contain new and significant information to justify publication?*

Yes

Does the Abstract (Summary) clearly and accurately describe the content of the article?

Yes

Is the problem significant and concisely stated?

Yes

Are the methods or research design described comprehensively? Is the statistical analysis adequate?

Yes

Are the interpretations and conclusions justified by the results?

Brazilian Dental Science

Yes

Is adequate reference made to other work in the field?

Yes

Is the language acceptable?

Yes

Manuscript Structure

Length of article is:*

Adequate

Number of tables is:

Adequate

Number of figures is:

Adequate

Please state any conflict(s) of interest that you have in relation to the review of this paper (state "none" if this is not applicable).

None.

Rating

Interest*

Average

Quality

Good

Brazilian Dental Science

Originality

Good

Overall

Good

Recommendation

Minor Revision

Would you be willing to review a revision of this manuscript?

Yes

Comments

Comments to the Author

This study evaluated, through a pilot trial, the efficacy of a solution used as an adjunct to periodontal treatment. The authors have produced a quality manuscript with interesting results that are relevant to potential further research. Below are some minor comments for the authors to help refine the article.

1- Please, check the grammar throughout the manuscript.
2- Although the manuscript describes a pilot clinical study, how were the twelve patients selected? Were any statistical tests applied?
3- Table 1 shows p-values for the demographic data; however, the legend does not mention the statistical method used.
4- Standardize the terminology used for adverse effects in the text and in the figure.
