

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77539
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS OF DRY EYES AMONG DENTAL STUDENTS -A SURVEY
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The authors must use a single terminology throughout the manuscript. Either use Dry Eyes or use Dry Eye Disease, the later one is the preferred terminology. At the initial point of the manuscript, use the complete terminology Dry Eye Disease (DED), followed by subsequent use of abbreviation DED only in the rest of the manuscript. 2. In the introduction, please clarify the sentences “In lense to average disease, however, has limited usefulness” and “Our team has extensive knowledge and research experience that has translated into high quality publications (13-18) (19-26) (27-32)”. The later sentence is not relevant in the context of the manuscript. 3. Please explain how the sample size of 100 was calculated. 4. Please explain what is dental population? Is the term dental population synonymous with dental students? 5. The sample size needs to be described by the authors in terms of age, gender etc. 6. Inclusion and exclusion criteria have not been mentioned by the authors. 7. Please provide the questionnaire and please mention how the questionnaire was validated. 8. Please rewrite the sentence “Measures such as a selection of participants randomly, steps to prevent asking irrelevant questions, placing restrictions over the participants are followed to minimize the sampling bias” in a more scientific manner and mention point by point what measures were taken by the authors. 9. In Figure 1, the authors described the percentage distribution of awareness among causes of dry eye damage, while this figure should actually depict the percentage of awareness among the participants and the legends should have been “aware, not aware and no response / don’t know” instead of “abrasion of the corneal surface (yellow), eye inflammation (violet) and all of the above (violet)”. Please modify the figure legends and description accordingly. 10. Rewrite the description of Figure 5, where all of the above option should be mentioned at last. 11. In Figure 7, very few risk factors have been included by the authors, while there are various risk factors for DED. Few more relevant risk factors could have been included in this study. 12. In Figure 8, the terminology should be “symptoms” of DED, not “look” of DED. The same needs to be modified in Figure 9 also. 13. In conclusion, the authors mentioned that the “The prevalence of dry eye is more in females than males”, however in this study, the authors did not collect data on presence of symptoms in the study population. The authors only assessed the awareness about the DED symptoms among the study population. So, the sentence needs to be omitted or modified accordingly. 	
Minor REVISION comments	The write up of the manuscript needs to be more scientific.	
Optional/General comments	The spelling mistakes and grammatical errors need to be addressed by the authors.	

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:	Shyam Sundar Das Mohapatra
Department, University & Country	Sri Sankaradeva Nethralaya, India