

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a comprehensive review of the use of music distraction as a non-invasive technique for managing dental anxiety in pediatric patients. This is particularly important as dental anxiety is a common barrier to effective dental care in children, leading to negative dental experiences and future avoidance of necessary treatment. By compiling existing research and evidence, the manuscript highlights the potential of music distraction as an accessible and cost-effective intervention to improve children's dental experiences and outcomes. It also opens the door for further research into integrating audio distraction with other behavior management strategies in pediatric dentistry.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Addition: Include specific examples or statistics from key studies to support the claims made in the abstract. This will provide more context and substantiate the effectiveness of music distraction. Clarification: Briefly mention how music distraction compares to other non-invasive techniques to give readers a better understanding of its relative effectiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust as it provides a thorough review of the literature on music distraction and its role in managing dental anxiety in children. It accurately explains the underlying mechanisms, such as the gate control theory of pain and distraction techniques, that support the use of music therapy. The paper also discusses both supporting and contradictory evidence, ensuring a balanced perspective. By referencing multiple studies, the manuscript highlights the effectiveness of music distraction while acknowledging areas for further research, thus presenting a comprehensive and technically sound analysis.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are generally sufficient and relevant to the topic. However, incorporating more recent studies (within the last five years) would strengthen the review by reflecting the latest advancements and findings in music therapy and pediatric dental anxiety management. Suggested Additional References: - Recent studies on the integration of music therapy in pediatric healthcare. - Research exploring new methods and technologies in non-pharmacological anxiety	

Review Form2

	management.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Some sentences could be rephrased for clarity and conciseness. For example, phrases like "Anxiety begins at a very young age, if not addressed at that point; it will result in more drastic consequences" could be streamlined to "Unaddressed anxiety from a young age can lead to more severe consequences." Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript. For instance, use either "music distraction" or "audio distraction" consistently to avoid confusion. eview the manuscript for minor typographical errors, such as misplaced commas or inconsistent use of hyphens.	
Optional/Generalcomments	The article is suitable for scholarly communication, but revising the text for clarity, consistency, and grammatical accuracy will strengthen its readability and impact.	

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:	Ramasubbareddy Challa
Department, University & Country	The TN DR MGR Medical University, India