

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_89844
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE AMONG THE DENTAL PRACTITIONERS TOWARDS PROSTHETIC PHASE OF IMPLANT IN VIDARBHA REGION OF INDIA - A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><u>01</u> The authors need to state the aims of the study at the end of the Introduction.</p> <p><u>02</u> No power analysis was performed. Therefore, it is not possible to know whether the analysis of the results of the present study is a true finding or a pure chance. This may compromise the entire validity of this study.</p> <p><u>03</u> "A validated questionnaire study was conducted that will help to find out knowledge that practitioners are applying in day-to-day practice." How was the questionnaire validated?</p> <p><u>04</u> Which software was used for the statistical analyses?</p> <p><u>05</u> "The questionnaires was electronically distributed among 260 participants, only 210 participants filled the questionnaire, making the responses of the study 80.76%." The manuscript needs a revision of English, not only for grammar, but also for syntax.</p> <p><u>06</u> Most of the Discussion section consists of paragraphs beginning with a repetition of the results followed by the citation of the results of other studies, without an actual discussion of the findings of the study. In other words, a discussion of the findings is inexistent.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bruno Chrcanovic
Department, University & Country	Malmö University, Sweden