

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_118391
Title of the Manuscript:	Oral health-related quality of life in response to root canal treatment in European population: a systematic review
Type of the 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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript titled "Oral health-related quality of life in response to root canal treatment in European population: a systematic review" is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>The title of the article, "Oral health-related quality of life in response to root canal treatment in European population: a systematic review," is suitable but could be refined for clarity and impact. For improved readability, the phrase "in response to" could be simplified to enhance clarity. The title can be made more concise while still conveying the key aspects of the study. Suggestions for improving the title: " Impact of Root Canal Treatment on Oral Health-Related Quality of Life in European Populations: A Systematic Review".</p> <p>Yes, the abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript appears to follow a systematic review methodology. -Kindly provide a detailed search strategy, including exact keywords, Boolean operators, and search strings. This enhances reproducibility. - Kindly indicate the number of reviewers that participated, and the process used to resolve any disagreements.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality is suitable. Kindly proofread the manuscript for language and grammar to improve readability.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>- Ensure that all tables and figures are properly labelled and referenced in the text.</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:	Pakit Tungsawat
Department, University & Country	Rangsit University, Thailand