

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81046
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis Of Bone Regenerative Potential Of Simvastatin Vs Platelet Rich Plasma In Mandibular Third Molar Extraction Socket- A Study Protocol
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>Smoking status is a very important factor, and must be mentioned with regard to patient selection and in analyses of results. Smoking delays healing of wounds.</p> <p>Alcohol must be recorded too as it increases bleeding tendency.</p> <p>Describe how to, if needed, prevent/reduce wash-out of Simvastatin and PRP from the extraction pockets and the length of time they have the local effect in the extraction socket.</p> <p>Describe how you will ensure as equal as possible surgery procedures, and operator equality.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>CBCT is an acronym, please give name</p> <p>No mention of degree and percent inclination of third molar relative to second molar, between study participant variation, please describe your choices.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Measure hs-C-reactive protein as a measure of associated inflammation and/or infection?</p> <p>Is it possible to apply Simvastatin and PRP in the same session? That would give a better comparison of the two treatments.</p> <p>A one-year comparative registration of study results would be an advantage.</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>Lise Lund Håheim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Of Oslo, Norway</b>