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Assessment of periodontal knowledge following a mass media oral health promotion campaign: a population-based study by Mahdia Gholami et al.

Abstract: Requires editing to make the sentences clear; for example fist sentence under results

1. Background:
   • First paragraph: Chronic diseases have occurred due to failure of oral health sciences advances…..such statements are “overstatements”
   • Para two: Could you elaborate how prevention of periodontal disease fits into the common risk factor approach
   • Page 6: para one; second sentence is not connected to any findings

2. General comments on the background:
   • Little is explored about the utility of mass media and knowledge improvement: What kinds of mass media do best for example in what perspectives and to which groups of target population for example.
   • Probably readers would want to know why you want to improve knowledge and whether there is any information tagging knowledge and practices. These are the areas that need exploration in the background
   • The importance of a healthy periodontium can be defended on its own merit with very little attention to its “far-fetched links” with life threatening diseases. These links have been overemphasized as if we don’t have other strong reasons of having a clean mouth (See for example the contents of your animation clip).

3. Instrument:
   • The three questions used to measure knowledge are too few. Could the authors explain why they had only three questions and whether the knowledge measured is sufficient for prevention of periodontal disease? Can the authors defend the scientific value of this gathered information?
   • While the questions had several options why was the response dichotomized?
   • Campaign visibility and background variables need to be included in the questionnaire. How was socioeconomic status measured?

4. Campaign effect
   • It will helpful to present both baseline and follow up measurements in figure 2
not just unit change

5. Discussion:

• What are practical implications of your findings; are you recommending a similar approach in future on a regular basis? What are the cost implications and who pays for such programs just in case they are to come out routinely? Are there any aspects you consider changed? ETC
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