

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77192
Title of the Manuscript:	Technical Quality of Endodontic Treatment Performed by Underperforming Undergraduate Dental Students
Type of the Article	Retrospective study

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>)

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	The major flaw of this study is the improper use of the chi-square test, in my opinion. This test is used to assess whether the difference in dichotomous results is influenced by the type of intervention. In this case, for example, the density of root canal obturation represents the result (acceptable / poor) but it is not clear which are the two types of intervention. It is not clear what p refers to.	
Minor REVISION comments	The Authors state that "the performance of underperforming dental students in the extra session was acceptable because they performed adequate obturation with acceptable length, filling density and root canal tapering in 80%, 41.7% and 55% of root canals, respectively". I do not agree: adequate filling density in 41.7% and root canal tapering in 55% cannot be considered acceptable. Moreover, 16 male and 54 female are the students who had to perform the test during an extra-session. It would be interesting to know how many students took the test during the regular session.	
Optional/General comments	The study is important because it highlights a problem in endodontic training	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saturnino Marco Lupi
Department, University & Country	University of Pavia, Italy