

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79957
Title of the Manuscript:	Root Canal Morphology of Mandibular First Premolars Using Radiography (In Vitro)
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: Objectives mentioned – Satisfactory Materials and Methodology –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of experimental groups • Inclusion and exclusion criteria should be mentioned <p>Conclusion - Not clear on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four root canals in first premolars • Careful searching for function canal in lower 1st molar – why 1st molar? Or is it a typo error? <p>Introduction 2nd and 3rd paragraph requires revision of English grammar. In 3rd paragraph Slowey reference (3) conclusion can be re-written using appropriate words. 4th paragraph also requires English grammar refining.</p> <p>Data Collection The reason for measuring the length is not explained in the study.</p> <p>Statistics: The various tests used in statistics and grammar used to explain the same could be rephrased.</p> <p>Discussion 1st para – “Inconsistency in vessel morphology...” – standard terminology could be used instead. Similarly, in the same paragraph “extra foundation” could be replaced with more suitable words. 2nd paragraph – “ordinary root canal life systems” – could be revised to more appropriate terminology. 3rd paragraph – “teeth was beautified at the bond lacquer intersection” – standard terminology to be used. Photographs depicting the procedure will be helpful in understanding the study. In the discussion, there is comparison drawn with first mandibular molar. Studies comparing with first premolar should be also mentioned. In the paragraph “in a Chinese population where prevalence of two or more canals in mandibular first premolar ..” the word channels could be changed to standard terminology. In the next paragraph – “multiplex” can be changed to more appropriate word. Terms like “horizontal channels, reticular teeth” – not clearly understood. Discussion could be revised with appropriate standard terminology and words.</p> <p>Conclusion Can be revised as it is not clear the percentage of variation in mandibular 1st premolar.</p> <p>Additional Comment: A CBCT or Micro-CT study would have been more beneficial to depict variations in canal anatomy.</p> <p>The above comes under Compulsory Revision Comments.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	N. Meena
Department, University & Country	Vokkaligara Sangha Dental College & Hospital, India