

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JPRI_95053</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A critical appraisal of studies on the cyclic fatigue resistance of HyFlex EDM nickel- titanium instrument</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Systematic Review</b>

### 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 REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p><b>No.</b> The manuscript is very poorly written. Therefore it has no importance. A systematic review has the highest level of evidence, and thus requires meticulous preparation of the manuscript. It should help the community to answer a research question and this manuscript does not meet the requirements.</p> <p><b>Not very appropriate.</b> A title should follow the PICO format. The author has not defined the PICO, especially the outcome assessment. To suggest a title, these aspects should be clear</p> <p><b>No.</b> Totally irrelevant. The word ' REC' in results is not clear. The conclusion is a big blunder, very much irrelevant for the study. Mentions about cirrhotic patients.</p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The author has to refer to PRISMA checklist. The studies cannot be based on few journals. They have to be selected from a data base. This gives a comprehensive outlook. There is no research question. Under methodology - there is no eligibility criteria mentioned, the search criteria ( MeSH) terms, study selection , data collection , risk of bias etc., are the vital components of a systematic review, which are lacking this manuscript.	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lavanya Anumula</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Narayana Dental College and Hospital, India</b>