

	Editor's comment	Author's comment <i>(If agreed with the editor, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)</i>
Is the manuscript important for the scientific community? Please write a few sentences explaining your answer	Yes. This manuscript addresses a well-established yet under-addressed issue in dental education—work-related musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) among students. By evaluating a 10-week ergonomic intervention through a randomized control design, the study contributes meaningful data that can inform curricular decisions across health professions education, especially given the multidisciplinary integration of occupational therapy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? Do you have any alternative Title in your mind?	Yes, clear and informative an alternate option could be: "Reducing Musculoskeletal Disorders in Dental Students Through Ergonomic Education: A Randomized Controlled Trial"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes. The abstract succinctly presents the background, purpose, methodology, key findings, and conclusion. It could be strengthened slightly by including specific statistical results from the post-intervention analysis to quantify the effect.	
Do you think the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications? If your answer is No, please provide suggestions	Yes. The manuscript is well-written, professional, and easy to follow. There are minimal issues with grammar or syntax, and the flow of ideas is logical and clear.	
Please provide your comments regarding the appropriateness of different sections of the manuscript.	Introduction: Well-developed, evidence-informed rationale for the study. Strong integration of relevant literature. Methods: Clearly described and methodologically sound. Inclusion of both quantitative and qualitative data enhances the richness of findings. One	

	<p>minor suggestion: the authors might clarify whether the Nordic Questionnaire was modified in any way (despite using the term “Modified”).</p> <p>Results: Detailed and supported with appropriate statistical analysis. Consider summarizing the main statistically significant findings more concisely for clarity.</p> <p>Discussion: Thoughtfully contextualized findings within existing literature. The study's strengths and limitations are transparently acknowledged.</p> <p>Tables/Figures: Relevant and clear. Consider condensing some of the data or referring to supplementary material to reduce redundancy.</p>	
<p>Do you think that the references in the manuscript are proper, recent and sufficient? If you have any suggestions, please write here.</p>	<p>Yes. The references are current, diverse, and appropriate, with multiple citations from 2020–2024. The authors demonstrate strong engagement with both dental and occupational therapy literature.</p>	

PART 1: Article Title: Position Yourself for Success: An Ergonomic Educational Program to Reduce Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders Among Dental Students

PART 2:

	Editor's comment	
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i></p> <p>No significant ethical concerns. The manuscript reports IRB approval and outlines thoughtful procedures to ensure voluntary participation and participant</p>	

	anonymity. Researchers also offered post-study interventions to control participants, further demonstrating ethical care.	
Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?	No. None are apparent from the text. It may be worth explicitly stating this in the manuscript if not already included.	
Do you think the article is plagiarized? If yes, please justify your answer and send us some proof.	No. There is no evidence of plagiarism. The work appears original and well-cited throughout.	
Do you think a Disclaimer is required to explain the history of this manuscript? (As in most cases chapters of reference books are extended versions of previously published articles in some journals)	No. The content appears original and tailored to this study. There is no indication that it is a reused or extended version of another publication.	

PART 3: Declaration of Competing Interest of the Editor:

Here reviewer should declare his/her competing interest. If nothing to declare he/she can write “I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer”

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

PART 4: Objective Evaluation:

Guideline	MARKS of this manuscript
Give OVERALL MARKS you want to give to this manuscript (Highest: 10 Lowest: 0) Guideline: Accept As It Is: (>9-10) Minor Revision: (>8-9)	9.2 This manuscript warrants acceptance with optional minor revisions. The work is strong in methodology, impact, and clarity. Revisions could include including specific statistical results from the post-intervention analysis to quantify the effect in the abstract and

Major Revision: (>7-8) Serious Major revision: (>5-7) Rejected (with repairable deficiencies and may be reconsidered): (>3-5) Strongly rejected (with irreparable deficiencies.): (>0-3)	streamlining tables and emphasizing key outcomes more concisely in the Results and Abstract sections.
---	---