

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79293
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative evaluation of effect of use of antifungal (clotrimazole) drug in preventing and reducing the severity of oral discomforts like mucositis, burning sensation, xerostomia and loss of taste sensation in cervicofacial radiotherapy
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 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. Abstract: Remove terms such as: objectives, study design, location and duration, results and conclusion. Make a text linking all these points; 2. Introduction: Which process does it refer to? Why is clinical cancer management a problem? I advise you to rewrite the entire first paragraph. 3. In the second paragraph, the author begins by saying that radiotherapy preserves structures, and at the end of the paragraph, the author ends up pointing out possible harmful effects, including structural ones. 4. I felt the lack of statistical data relevant to the research, as well as a better explanation of what mucositis is, better explained causes and effects, as this is part of the central theme, a better explanation is appropriate, as well as radiotherapy. 5. In the materials and methods, he says that the author used an antifungal agent, and talked about candidiasis, but the mucositis studied in the research was not specified in the introduction. 6. The graphs of the results need to be revised, mainly the structures of the tables, it is similar to tables and not tables; 7. Better conceptualize the term xerostomia in the introduction; 8. Better rewrite the conclusion. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alex France Messias Monteiro
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Paraiba, Brazil