

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76545
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE & PRACTICE OF PEDODONTISTS REGARDING DISINFECTION PROTOCOL DURING COVID 19 PANDEMIC: A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY
Type of the Article	Short 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>In general, the English in the paper can be understood. There are a number of terms that are not used in scientific literature when it is written in English. The abstract highlights a major error in the paper in that it attempts to combine two separate topics.</p> <p>introduction It is far too short and does not attempt to review previous studies of oral manifestations of gastrointestinal diseases. It is apparent that the authors did not perform a thorough literature search before commencing their study. The methods are hardly described at all. Hence it is impossible to know the design of the study. It would be impossible for another group to repeat the study using the same methodology. It is necessary to include a list of all the data that were extracted from each patient record. It is also necessary to explain who carried out this task. If it was performed by more than one person, how did they calibrate?</p> <p>Discussion; it should but first the paper has to explain (in the methods section) exactly what methodology was used. It should then critique it, explaining its strong points and weaknesses. In this context, one common weakness when surveying patient notes is that they are frequently incomplete and that the different clinicians who write them may describe presenting symptoms, treatment, etc in different ways.</p> <p>Conclusion;</p> <p>It would be better if they were presented as bullet points. It is unusual to cite a reference in conclusions.</p> <p>References; to correct ref.4,7,8</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu-Hussein Muhamad
Department, University & Country	Arab-American University, Greece