

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77387
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude, and practice of dental implants among dental post graduates and practitioners in wardha district: A cross sectional study.
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:

(<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>The Proposal is badly written. The Paper is to record a proposed research project that is a cross-sectional study. The study has not been carried out, and yet at no time is the word 'PROPOSED' used. The title should include: "..... a proposed crosssectional study."</p> <p>Background: The statement</p> <p>"As a result the actual picture was examined..."is in no way A scientific/research statement.It requires drastic improvement or should be removed. Further, the use of the word 'was' implies that the research has already been carried out. This must also be corrected.</p> <p>Objective: 1. "To assess the attitude of dental implants among...." Is incorrect. It should read, "To assess the attitude to dental implants among...." 2. "To assess the practice of dental implants among...." Is incorrect. It should read, "To assess the practice of dental implantology among...." Methodology: 1. Again it is "The practice of dental implantology...", not dental implants. 2. "The aspect of the results that will be examined...." Has no meaning at all in the opening paragraph. What aspect of the results? 3. "A suitable sample strategy was used based on the replies received following the survey." Is PAST tense. What do the authors want to say? 4. "The results will be determined based on knowledge...." NO, this statement has no research meaning. One might say instead, "The Hypothesis is that knowledge and attitude and experience will determine the practice of dental implantology." 5. "The expected results..." the word cannot be used. Again, it should be "The Hypothesis is that knowledge...."</p> <p>Conclusion: You cannot at this stage give a conclusion. The survey has not been carried out. However, it must be brought to the authors' attention that "dentistry is in the air..." is not a sentence that can be used in a serious research proposal.</p> <p>Throughout this mis-quoted 'conclusion' both present and past tense are used, both implying the survey has been carried out.</p> <p>Both Expected Results and Conclusion need to be removed.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>What should be written here is either an HYPOTHESIS or a PICO question with a DISCUSSION .</p> <p>An actual DISCUSSION should be carried out using the information from the quoted references. Further, then an argument for why the survey group has included both inexperienced and experienced practitioners can be put forward.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Shane McCrea
Department, University & Country	Kings College London, UK