

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_106362
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of the dental surgeon in the multiprofessional team: a systematic review
Type of the Article	Systematic Review

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This article is a review of the qualitative literature review concerning the importance of the multidisciplinary medical approach in patients with cancer, heart disease, patients in intensive care units and in Family Health Strategy. I consider this article very important to the scientific community because the multidisciplinary approach should always be addressed for the benefit of our patients in all the medical disciplines.</p> <p>I think the title summarizes very well the content of the article.</p> <p>The abstract explains in a brief way the whole article.</p> <p>The articles presents all the essential sections that are needed to be addressed in a good article, good introduction, the method is very well explained, so are the results with the discussion, the conclusions are very well described and the necessary references are present.</p> <p>The article is a review of the literature the method used to select the articles with the exclusion and inclusion criteria was very well executed.</p> <p>The references I think are sufficient and recent, because this topic is not easy to find.</p> <p>I really liked the article, my only suggestion could be in a future publication try to address some other medical specialties, like gynecology or gastroenterology (patients with diabetes mellitus) that usually present oral problems very important to address in a multidisciplinary approach.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall I enjoyed reading this article and made me think about the importance of medicine and its multidisciplinary approaches and the great benefits this brings to the patients.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Valverde
Department, University & Country	Universidad Latina de Costa Rica, Costa Rica