

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81911
Title of the Manuscript:	Astronaut era: Does your child patient accept your new look and practicality of using Behaviour Modification Techniques in COVID Times?
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.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>Based on the title, there comes an exciting research idea, there is an element of novelty, but after entering the content, I found some shortcomings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title could be adjusted more because the title written by the author does not describe the content or is different from what is discussed in the content, which is more about the dentist's perception of the use of behavior modification techniques 2. The purpose of the research is to assess knowledge, attitude, skills, and preparedness, but from the available questionnaires, I only see elements of belief and perception, so the objectives need to be adjusted. More specific measuring tools are needed to measure knowledge, attitudes, skills, and preparedness so that these four domains can be measured accurately. 3. This research method using WhatsApp based needs to be explained more. For example, are the questionnaire questions asked one by one as a text message to the respondent? or did the respondent receive a link to the questionnaire to be filled out in another format? 4. The developed questionnaire needs to be explained in stages. What is the validity? What is reliability? 5. Analysis of the results has not been written that this is only a descriptive analysis. 6. The discussion does not comprehensively discuss the results obtained from the research. Try the author looking for other articles that can support or contradict your results and discuss it from there. 7. The author's conclusion is not related to the research objectives. there is no common thread from your writing 	
Minor REVISION comments	Many typos that need to be fixed	
Optional/General comments	the author can rewrite based on the comments above so that the manuscript will be in better and suitable form	

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:	Arlette Suzy Setiawan
Department, University & Country	Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia