

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_104164
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of microleakage associated with four different endodontic sealers
Type of the Article	Original 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.journalpri.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article says nothing to be novel, and the concept of the study is confirmatory. The title is clearly describing the article. Abstract is including the essential findings and it is concise. Introduction is clear and well-structured. However related systematic reviews demonstrating the new techniques of microleakage evaluation are crucial. The description of the Methods used not adequate, the evaluation was not repeated (No proper inter or intra-examiner evaluation). No adequate justification in the discussion section. Degree and radius of curvature not standardized. No standard proposed protocol applied demonstrating the clinical and radiographical evaluation of samples. The data presented in an acceptable order; the way data are shown are valued. No any representative figure illustrating the actual results. However, they all necessary. The authors' interpretations not clearly justified. The authors not provided a solid scientific rationale for their applied methodologies. The cited References appropriate and accurate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Linguistic evaluation, indexing and similarity checking are mandatory</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bestoon Mohammed Faraj
Department, University & Country	Univesrity of Sulaimani, College of Dentistry Kurdistan, Iraq