

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_80844
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation And Correlation Of Pulpal Calcification In The Patients With Cardiovascular Diseases In Vidarbha Region
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>)

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The article is interesting and pertinent, due to the possibility of early diagnosis of cardiological pathologies. The article is also original, with clear methodology and easy to be reproduced.</p> <p>Although interesting, the article needs English rewriting. In the beginning, the reader simply can not go through the reading text due to lack of fluency, with too many periods and short sentences, which should be connected to enhance reading. For example, in lines 2,3 and four from the Introduction, you have "There are various causes of calcification in the soft tissues like muscles of body including the organs. One of the causes is reviewed as deficiency of Vitamin k2. The dental pulp is a soft tissue enclosed by the hard tissues of teeth. As I said, too many information not connected, and the result is a dull, obliterated text as a whole. I would suggest: "There are many causes of calcification in the soft tissues, such as the muscles of the body, including different organs; being one of the causes the deficiency of Vitamin k2. The dental pulp is a soft tissue enclosed by the hard tissues of teeth". As I said, there are grammatical mistakes and lack of cohesion.</p> <p>In the methodology, the reader understands that the article is to be accomplished in the future. Observe the sentence: "The present study comprises of 30 patients out of which 15 patients will be in test group and 15 patients in control group". Later on, in the discussion part, you have: "According to one study pulp stones were 41.8% in which females showed higher pulp stones than males and maxillary teeth had higher pulp stones than mandibular teeth.[1,11]". As one can see, the authors have to decide if the work will be done, or has already been made. Situations like this you also find in the methodology.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Improve the reading text and English revision is necessary	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is original, interesting both to the endodontic community as for the cardiological society.	

**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>Luciano Barreto Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Faculdade de Odontologia do Recife (FOR), Brazil</b>