**Manuscript evaluation guidelines**Title: Ethical Perspectives of Advertising among Dental Healthcare Providers and Health Consumers  
  
  
1. Importance of the paper  
  
 Does it address issues relevant to the fields of bioethics and medical ethics in the developing countries?

Yes, the paper deal with ethical issues around dental advertising.  
  
2. Is it topical?  
  
 Is the issue discussed from another country's/culture perspective?

The paper is discussed as per Indian context.  
  
  Will it influence practice or policy?

Yes, but the methodology is currently very poorly written and must be rewritten by the author.
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4. Conclusions  
           Is the interpretation warranted, unwarranted, well developed?

Conclusions drawn are not well developed  
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5. Other comments

**Introduction:**

Line 89 - needs grammatical correction.

Line 91 - needs grammatical correction.

Line 91 - Needs more description regarding the existing dilemma.

Line 94 – Objective needs reframing. It must be made clear regarding advertising by whom and whose perspective the study intends to capture.

**Materials and methods:**

Study period is not defined.

No clear information regarding the sampling frame.

No information regarding sampling method used.

No sample size calculation.

Line 100 - Dental health consumer word is not defined

Line 102 – To whom the questionnaire was given in print form and to whom in the SurveyMonkey is not clear.

How was informed consent obtained for information collected through SurveyMonkey?

**Results**

Line 108 – Reframe into a good English sentence.

Line 138 – General statements are not permitted in results section

Results appear to be fragmented, and needs to put under proper subheading. Avoid repetition of content in table and text.

Table 1 point 6 has serial number error.

Table 1 is very lengthy, either reduce it or consider making it into two appropriate table

Table 2 last question can be removed from table and written as text in results section.

**Discussion**

Line 182 – Not in line with the study objectives

Discussion is fragmented. Discussion needs to be written in a systematic way considering the most important points of results. Ethical issues have very limited discussion.

**Conclusion**

Line – 212 to 214 are not relevant to conclusion.
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