

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77053
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Effectiveness of Denture Adhesive after Incorporating Antifungal Agent – 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>This manuscript evaluated the antimicrobial and adhesive force of denture adhesives modified with various concentrations of Miconazole Nitrate.</p> <p>Few comments are provided in the manuscript document. The following are some of the most important points that should be addressed to improve this manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Need for the study should be justified in the introduction section.</li> <li>2. In methodology, briefly describe the procedures used to evaluate the antimicrobial and adhesive force tests.</li> <li>3. The entire results section should be rewritten.</li> <li>4. The mean and Standard deviation values are given in table 1 and 3 for each specimen. How the Mean and Standard deviations are calculated for a single specimen. I assume that the Am1....Am10 are ten individual specimens in table1. Similarly, ad1 ... Ad10 in table 3.</li> <li>5. In the discussion section, give relevant arguments for increasing the antimicrobial activity and decrease in adhesive force in various groups.</li> <li>6. Compare the results of the present study with the other similar studies if any.</li> <li>7. The conclusion should be based on the findings the present study. Rewrite the conclusion section.</li> <li>8. Numerous grammatical errors need to be corrected.</li> <li>9. Check the appropriateness of the usage of the term "anti-mycological" as the term mycology indicates the scientific study of the fungi.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Mention et al. in italics wherever it comes in the manuscript. For example, Vallittu P <i>et al.</i></p> <p>Also, mention the organisms names in italics. For example, <i>Candida albicans</i>.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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:	<b>Rama Krishna Alla</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vishnu Dental College, India</b>