

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80208
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of restorative crown of different cuspal inclination and occlusal contact on stress distribution in mandibular second premolar with different ferrule configuration and peripheral bone- 3D finite element analysis
Type of the Article	Study Protocol

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Plagiarism is the copying of someone else's expressions. Traditionally, it has been considered, along with fabrication and falsification as one of the three major forms of research misconduct .</p> <p>The middle of the Introduction (i.e. the second paragraph of full-length reports) serves to develop the specific issue(s) that this study will address. If the study is about a form of therapy, this paragraph or passage presents that therapy. If the paper is about some particular problem in medical care, this paragraph or passage explains what that problem is. If the paper is about some special group of patients, this paragraph or passage explains who they are and what their issue is.</p> <p>Third, the Introduction as a whole should also elucidate what the relevance of the study is. It should explain how the study will shed light on the real world problem identified by the authors. It should make it clear why the readers should care what the results were.</p> <p>The reference list provides the bibliographic information on all the works you cited. It enables readers to retrieve further literature supporting the assertions of your paper. No other works should appear in the reference list that you did not cite in your paper.</p> <p><b>The writing style of the Introduction should be comparatively simple and fast flowing. It is less ponderous than the Discussion, (and of course it does not involve the technicalities, numbers, and details seen in the Methods and Results).</b></p> <p>In sum, the Introduction should not be written as a barrier wall that makes people stop reading the paper. It should be written in a style that quickly guides them into the paper and prepares them for what will follow.</p> <p>So how do you decide if some result you are reporting is "advanced" or "unusual" and needs this kind of accompanying explanation? Well, it is worth keeping in mind that most readers of medical journals are not researchers; they are practicing health care professionals, with little or no formal training in statistical analysis.</p> <p>Abstracts should be as informative as possible, within the word limit allowed. To help reach this goal, most journals converted to structured abstracts with subheadings (instead of unstructured summaries) a couple decades ago, at least for research papers, and often for other types of papers as well .</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The reason the abstract is the most important part of the paper is because most people will never read anything more than the abstract (unfortunately)</p> <p>. Present your case like a lawyer. Explicitly or implicitly, every Discussion that says anything meaningful is presenting an argument for or against something, however moderately. Your Discussion should present your line of reasoning, based on the past literature and your current findings</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Make sure your abstract is as informative as possible , It should state your study aim or question exactly. Its Methods subsection should tell the readers about the study design, the study setting, the kind of subjects, the interventions performed, and how the outcomes were measured and analyzed.</p> <p>Citations should only be made if they are warranted for scientific/scholarly reasons. Do not cite papers for the primary sake of manipulating citation metrics or courting favor with other people .</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>