

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
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>

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>General Comments</p> <p>The study aims to assess the efficacy of Simvastatin against PRP in terms of bone regeneration potential in the mandibular third molar extraction socket. Though the concept seems to be good, there are certain concerns that need to be addressed</p> <p>Introduction: The author has given a good justification for choosing an alternative to PRP. An additional reason for using an alternative method can be that- it requires the patient's blood to be drawn and is invasive. This can also be a good additional argument in favour of going for an alternative method. It is mentioned in the manuscript that statins have shown osseoinductive effects. However, I have noticed that the references you quoted are mostly molecular biology studies or studies done on rodents. Is it possible to give additional references where it has been used for the specific purpose topically for bone repair and/or regeneration? "Although there are many studies which prove Simvastatin as potent bone regenerative agent, its efficacy is still a matter of investigation."- Kindly add references</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Kindly mention ethical clearance details and trial registration details Can you be more specific with the inclusion criteria? Is there any difficulty level that you have assigned for choosing 3rd molar extraction patients like amount of bone covering the tooth etc.? If patients requiring bilateral 3rd molar extraction will be selected, how can you divide the 15 patients into 2 groups of 15 each? Maybe you can rephrase the grouping to state that one side impaction will be for one group and the other side for the other group. Will the procedure be conducted for both the sides be done in the same appointment? Please clarify. Since PRP and Simvastatin preparation will be done before the 3rd molar extraction, you can shift the method of preparation details to before 'Extraction of Third Molar and Packing of Extraction Socket' to maintain a flow in the script. After the procedure, will there be any medication prescribed to patients. How are you planning to report any adverse events or side effects?</p> <p>Discussion: Please be more specific about why bone regeneration after 3rd molar extraction. Maybe you can add the sequelae of insufficient bone regeneration. Saikrishna Degala and Nikita A. Bathija and Ravi Bhujbal and Neelima Maliket are mentioned in the text but I could not find these authors quoted in the references. These studies seem to be mentioned for the sake of review of literature. Authors need to justify the need and methods used for this study by a convincing argument related to the above mentioned studies.</p> <p>References: References 10 to 22 are bunched together and mentioned in the last part of discussion. All these studies are related to PRP. Some studies seem superfluous. I would suggest that some unnecessary references be removed and references related to simvastatin be added.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Kindly do spelling and grammar check. Minor spelling and grammar mistakes are there.	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Subha Anirudhan
Department, University & Country	Sri Ramakrishna Dental College And Hospital, India