

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_75248
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparative evaluation of the amount of sorption and solubility seen in soft liner with herbal and commercially available denture cleanser - an invitro study”
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>Abstract: Background is missing in the beginning of this section, one or two lines are recommended. Using (gauge) it has to be replaced with measure or assess They have to use verbs in the past (The samples will then ...). Methodology it is preferable to be replaced with materials and methods. P-values it should be written (p -values). Conclusion: the solubility and sorption values of clinsodent group were higher compared to herbal denture cleanser group.</p> <p>Materials & methods: <u>The research question is not there</u> <u>They have to start this section with type of study and study design, study setting, ethical approval of the college /institute</u> <u>Application of the soft liner to the prepared specimen</u> (No explanation how authors controlled the thickness of the soft liners layers). No reference for manufacturing and preparation of soft liners.</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>In the present study, synthetic saliva was schooled to mimic the natural saliva. Nevertheless, it did not take account of the dynamic and 24-hour disparities of normal saliva which comprises of diet being consumed, microorganisms and supplementary figures as well as the acid base changes affecting the pH of the saliva. Other than the above mentioned variations customized oral settings also play an important role. Thus the drawback of the study.</p> <p>This paragraph has to be deleted from conclusion section and it can added to methods section or in the discussion section NOT in conclusion</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction First paragraph must give definition of complete denture, indications, limitations. Why we have to use soft liners? What are the benefits expected from its use. What are the differences between the two soft liners? Merits and demerits of each one?</p> <p>Discussion: ojah et al (capital letter of the author and year of publication) mansoor et al (capital letter of the author and year of publication)</p> <p>References section: It has to be written in standardized way and remove all that started with available from</p> <p>More updated references out of 15 only 3 references were recent most of it old ones</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Hossam Abdelmagyd
Department, University & Country	Gulf Medical University, UAE