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**Abstract:**

- Methodology: Three questionnaires? Materials and methods imply two questionnaires.

- Conclusion: According to the Results, 73.2% considered advertising ethical, approximately 50% agreed that advertising can help their practice. Then, how is the first sentence correct? What is the basis for the last sentence?

**Materials and methods:**

- This section is grossly inadequate.

- When was this study done? What was the time duration?

- How were the participants selected? How were they contacted? How was informed consent obtained from consumers and providers?

- Inclusion criteria and Exclusion criteria are not mentioned.

- How was the questionnaire validated? By whom? Was a pilot study conducted?

- How many questionnaires were prepared? Two or three? In which languages?

- How was the sample size estimated?

- Was any sampling method followed for selection of study participants?

- No details of the statistical analysis of data are given.

**Results:**

- Age distribution of health care providers and consumers is not given.

- For providers, years of experience has not been considered.

- Materials and methods says 5 point Likert scale. This is not reflected in the Results section; data displayed is only for a 4 point scale.

- Also, what is neutral? It is not reflected in the Tables or Figures.

- Fig. 2 does not match with data in Tables 1 and 2.

- Tables and Figures are incorrect. They do not correlate with the text.

- The entire Results section should be rewritten.

**Discussion:**

- “The study results depicted the lack of awareness and knowledge about the code of Ethics existing among the community of healthcare providers and consumers.” This survey has questions only on attitude, not knowledge or practice. This sentence is incorrect.

- “Our survey results were also in accordance with the results of Dable et al that 53.19% of the respondents confirmed that advertising does not have any effect on a dental practice7.

This study also established the reality that word of mouth can be one of the best forms of advertising.

Our results were also in accordance with statement of Dable et al that the internet and social networks have also changed the milieu enormously7.

This was well proved by our results that the consumer groups select their dentists through researched selection.”

The Discussion is full of such vague and misleading statements which are not reflected in the Methodology and Results sections. According to the Methodology and Results sections, these variables have not even been evaluated in this survey.

- Similarly, “The study also reflects on the lack of awareness of oral hygiene and the importance of routine regular visits to dentists among consumers.” Where has this variable been mentioned in the Methodology and Results sections?

- The Discussion seems to be based on variables which have not even been evaluated in this study.

- Limitations are not mentioned.

**Conclusion:**

- When knowledge and practice have not been evaluated, how can a comment be made about “integrity”?

- Conclusion should be limited to the findings of the study vis-a-vis its Aim.

**References:**
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- In the Text, Reference 7 is quoted after Reference 8.

- The References are not uniformly according to Vancouverstyle.