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Dear Prof. Barde,

Reviewers' comments on your work have now been received.  You will see that they are advising not to publish this work in this journal against publication of your work.  Therefore, on behalf of the Editors, I must reject it.You may submit this work to the other relevant journal of our publication.

For your guidance, I append the reviewers' comments below.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider your work.

Yours sincerely,
Managing Editor
Oral Health and Dental Management

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1: There are a number of problems with the design of the study and the analysis of the data that make the findings questionable. The following comments  address these issues:
1.     There is no indication that the person evaluating the results was blinded to the treatment.
2.     The first side was always treated with Oxum, which introduces a bias into the results. This should have been randomized.
3.     It is unclear how you changed your measurements to percentages.
4.     You do not show the tablet use data.
5.     The statistical analysis is incorrect. Instead of a T test you should have used repeated measures  ANOVA.
6.     Even assuming the T test is correct, when I calculated the P values, they did not show the same as those presented.  Thus, where you showed significant differences, my calculations did not show this.

Reviewer #2: Reviewers comments
Many thanks for asking me to review the paper " Evaluation of Effect and Comparison of Superoxide Solution (Oxum) with Povidone Iodine (Betadine) on Pain, Trismus and Swelling after the Surgical Extraction of Impacted Mandibular Third Molar"
I have number of concerns regarding the manuscript.
The introduction is informative however, not backed up by the references.
Composition of oxum and mechanism of action is reproduced from reference (which is not strong).
Methodology is vague and incomplete without backed up by the references. What clinical measures were observed to evaluate the post-operative socket.
Sample size evaluation is not discussed.
The discussion is (as is the whole paper) not at all written and referenced in an appropriate manner.
The manuscript require major revision.
I am sorry to say that currently the manuscript is not publishable.
The authors should consider present this in a more better way with sound methodology and description.