

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78302
Title of the Manuscript:	The Prevalence of Dental Anxiety Among Dental Patients in Qassim Region
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:

<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-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>Abstract :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective: line number 2 mention the country name fully Kingdom of.... • Under result section merger both the paragraphs together. • Result section second paragraph, authors can revise the statements like.....The findings shows that female pt are significantly manifest more dental anxiety than their..... If the abstract does not exceed the word count mention the mean and p values . You can remove the second line of the second paragraph of the result section • Conclusion is the exact repetition of the result section. So, revise the conclusion section <p>Method section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authors could mention the method section with few subtopics such as participants, procedure, instruments/tools and statistical analysis used in this study. This would help the readers to understand what type of pt were selected and excluded, how the ethical protocol and procedures were followed in administering the questionnaire. In addition, what statistics were used to analyse the objectives. • The authors could mention the detailed objectives of each analysis/ tables as the manuscript shows only objectives related to the prevalence of the dental anxiety. • Under abstract result section shows that 19% of participants were severely suffering from dental anxiety. How the authors determine the sever, mild and moderate is not mentioned in the method section under instruments/ Tools. • Is there any cut off score to determine anxiety and no dental anxiety?. If yes mention in the method section under the instrument/ tools section. However, the cut off score is mentioned in the table but better to mention in the method section under instrument subsection for readers to understand clearly • What type of pt were chosen for this study? Pt who had received treatment earlier were included or not? • Page number 6, 7 and 8 already shows the result section but manuscript shows result and discussion title in page 8. • Authors could consider mentioning the result and discussion separately. • Discussion section lacks how the current study findings are consistent or different from other past studies. • Manuscript does not show how the ethical approval had been obtained on this study 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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> Manuscript does not show how ethical approval had been obtained on this study.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saravanan Coumaravelou
Department, University & Country	Aarupadai Veedu Medical College & Hospital, India