

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80062
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation Of Preventive And Interceptive Orthodontic Treatment Need In School Going Children Between 6-9 Years And 9.1- 12 Years In Central India Population
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:

<https://www.journalprijournal.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>The Title is too long y (do not adhere to the journal's requirements for this aspect) Has 169 characters counting the spaces.</p> <p>Abstract: there are acronyms in its wording and exceed the number of words it should contain. Objectives: three objectives appear declare. We considered that the second and third objectives can be unified (reformulate)</p> <p>Material and methods: The ethical principles and procedures that were taken into account aren't declared. The criteria taken account to evaluate the need of treatment isn't explain, either the author who refers is taken as the criterion. It isn't explained how each of the declared objectives will be output.</p> <p>The results obtained in the present research do not appear in the revised version.</p> <p>Discussion: The results obtained aren't compared (or it is not clear) with those of other authors, as well as the opinion of the author (s) of the investigation of why it happens. It is limited to commenting the results of three previous authors (Karaiskos N et. al. (2005); Onyeaso CO (2004) and Onyeaso CO et al. (2003)</p> <p>Conclusions: Poorly written and do not lead to the objective. Have implicit elements of the methods.</p> <p>References: 12 references are declared with a 58.3% update.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Raise the level of updating of references.	

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:	Jacqueline Medrano Montero
Department, University & Country	Center for the Investigation and Rehabilitation of Hereditary Ataxias, Cuba