

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_100326
Title of the Manuscript:	Internal Morphological variability of mandibular premolars in North Indian Population
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

1.	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) Yes</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Reframe the Title as mentioned above.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Structured Abstract recommended</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? No</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? No, but needs major modifications which is mentioned above.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No, Recent references requested to add and in Vancouver style (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Reframe the abstract-Structured Abstract</p> <p>2. Modify the title- Add study design which type of study e.g retrospective</p> <p>3. Add need of study in Introduction and concise the same.</p> <p>4. Aim and objectives should be clearly stated in manuscript</p> <p>5. Ethics registration number is mandatory.</p> <p>6. How sample size was calculated? Explain sampling formula and technique for same.</p> <p>7. In case of CBCT interpretation how inter and intra-observer bias was minimized or removed.</p> <p>8. Pilot study was done for same. Explain in detail.</p> <p>9. Configuration of CBCT machine and software used for visualization and interpretation.</p> <p>10. Study cannot be conducted in Conservative Dentistry. Its Oral Radiology department where CBCT usually is present.</p> <p>11. Material and methods should be clear??? Did you interpret all the CBCT or some Radiologist was involved????</p> <p>12. How family history was taken if its retrospective study</p> <p>13. Result should be clearly stated with the statistical analysis</p> <p>14. Poor resolution images can be replaced</p> <p>15. Conclusion should be clear</p> <p>16. Reference in Vancouver style</p> <p>17. Atleast 70% of reference should be from 2017 onwards.</p> <p>18. Grammatical corrections should be done.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Yes</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments Minimize the plagiarism and modify according to comments given</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shams UI Nisa
Department, University & Country	Bharati Vidyapeeth Deemed to be University, Dental College and Hospital, India