

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JPRI_79237  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF SURFACE ROUGHNESS OF ALKASITE RESTORATIVE MATERIAL (CENTION N) AFTER BRUSHING SIMULATION WITH HERBAL AND FLUORIDATED TOOTHPASTE - AN IN-VITRO 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

### PART 1: Review Comments

|                                     | Reviewer's comm   | 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>What is a good title? We define it as the fewest possible words that adequately describe the contents of the paper.<br/>The abstract should (1) state the principal objectives and scope of the investigation, (2) describe the methods employed, (3) summarize the results, and (4) state the principal conclusions.</p> <p><b>The abstract should never give any information or conclusion that is not stated in the paper. Literature must not be cited in the abstract (except in rare instances, such as modification of a previously published method).</b></p> <p>For materials, include the exact technical specifications, quantities, and source or method of preparation. Sometimes it is even necessary to list pertinent chemical and physical properties of the reagents used.</p> | <p>When writing the abstract, examine every word carefully. If you can tell your story in 100 words, do not use 200. Economically and scientifically, it doesn't make sense to waste words.</p> <p>For methods the usual order of presentation is chronological. Obviously, however, related methods should be described together, and straight chronological order cannot always be followed. For example, even if a particular assay was not done until late in the research, the assay method should be described along with the other assay methods, not by itself in a later part of the materials and methods section.</p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>In describing the methods of the investigations, you should give (or direct readers to) sufficient details so that a competent worker could repeat the experiments. If your method is new (unpublished), you must provide all of the needed detail. If, however, the method has been published in a journal, the literature reference should be given.</p> <p><b>The introduction should have posed one or more questions. The discussion should indicate what the findings say about the answers. Failure to address the initial questions commonly afflicts discussions. Be sure the discussion answers what the introduction asked.</b></p>   | <p><b>There is only one rule for a properly written materials and methods section: Enough information must be given so that the experiments could be reproduced by a competent colleague.</b></p>  |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | <p>The citation order system is simply a system of citing the references (by number) in the order in which they appear in the paper.</p>  | <p><b>So, take the same care with your references that you do with other aspects of your work. The effort is likely to serve you well.</b></p>   |

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                     |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Abu-Hussein Muhamad</b>          |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University of Athens, Greece</b> |