

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2201
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Music Distraction in Managing Anxious Paediatric Dental Patients- A Review
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I like the manuscript and think it would be a valuable addition to the literature. There is very little published in the area of utilizing audio distraction for dental procedures. I like that music was a focus, as well as other types of audio distractions. I found the table to be very informative, and I like that information was included on mechanisms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, however, the introduction focuses on audio distraction a bit more than it does music so that might be another possible title. Or perhaps another thought would be "audio distraction through music". On the other hand, the article is not just about music but also includes other forms of audio distraction, so I am wondering if "audio distraction" would be the more accurate focus and title of the article and introduction.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	• I suggest removing the term "music therapy". Music therapy is a profession that is conducted by a trained, board certified, or otherwise credentialed, professional. Therefore, unless a music therapist is present and working with the patient, it cannot be considered music therapy. It can however, be considered "music" or a "therapeutic use of music" or as is mentioned in the title "music distraction". Research in music therapy has demonstrated a positive response, decreased perception of pain, decreased anxiety, etc. Part of that is due to the music itself, but part of that is due to the therapeutic relationship (or as you wrote – interpersonal process) between the patient and therapist. • Some of the effect behind "distraction" is also "alternate engagement" – it's a shifting of focus and attention to something else, in this case music, that engages the patient's attention and moves it from the negative stimulus to the positive. • You may just want to focus on music or the therapeutic effects of music in the abstract itself. Then in the body of the paper you could delineate more between this and music therapy itself.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Overall, yes.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I think overall the manuscript is scientifically correct and technically sound. I think adding some more recent articles, and/or some of the research that shows results that are not as positive would also show the other side of the research. The biggest concern I have though is calling this "music therapy" when it is not. I would not be comfortable with the article moving forward with it being implied that music therapy is being used with pediatric dental patients.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It seems that quite a few references are missing, many of which are negative studies. However, there are some more recent studies that could also be included such as: Alkahtani ZM, Zakirulla M, Alshehri ES, Alzahtani AM, Alshehri MM. The effect of music on children's anxiety during dental treatment. J	

Review Form2

:	Res in Med & Dent Sci. 2020; 8(3):39-43.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Somewhat, but it could be better.However there still needs to be some correction of type-o's and wording as it just does not read smoothly in many places. In some places words are left out(such as "the") that if they are included would make it easier to read the sentences. Changing some of the grammar and tenses in places would also allow for more consistency, complete and correct sentences, and easier reading. I can provide specific examples if needed.	
Optional/Generalcomments	• In the first paragraph of the introduction it was stated that dental anxiety is at the fourth and the ninth position among intense fear. I'm confused as to how it can be both. • You may want to double check the citations. For example, on the second page in the first paragraph under Audio Distraction in Anxious Dental Patients, the second sentence begins, "Based on the theory of McCaul and Mallot...", however, there is no citation listed here until the next sentence. • Om page 2, second full paragraph under Audio Distraction in Anxious Dental Patients, I'm not sure the average reader will know what is meant by "decrease the chair side time" as I am not sure what it means	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lisa Gallagher
Department, University & Country	USA