

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_97169
Title of the Manuscript:	DENTIST 'AN ARSENAL' IN THE JOURNEY OF 'TOOTH IN THE EYE'-THE OOKP
Type of the Article	Review 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The topic of this manuscript is particularly interesting as it considers a research question that is rear in medical (dental) practice. Maybe it will be better to initially avoid abbreviations in the title of the paper, or if used – to be properly explained. Ex. "Dentist 'an arsenal' in the journey of 'tooth in the eye'- The Osteo-Odonto-Kerato-Prosthesis (OOKP)" Yes No, the manuscript is lacking a METHODS section. Yes Yes The authors have merged the method and findings sections together for reasons I do not understand. In the method section, only explain the type of study, search method, search keywords, data extraction, quality/bias assessment, and analysis. How many articles were included and why some articles were excluded (and the PRISMA flowchart) should be presented in the findings section. I recommend general characteristics and outcomes of included studies (14 articles) to be presented in a summarizing table.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript needs a revision due to its flaws in methodology. Findings and discussion are presented clearly and comprehensively.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nadya Avramova
Department, University & Country	Medical University, Bulgaria