

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82014
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Levobupivacaine and Ropivacaine in Postoperative Pain control After Surgical Removal of Impacted Mandibular Third Molar: A Split Mouth Randomized Clinical Trial
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalpri.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	This paper is about comparing the effects of two anesthetics in dental treatment. I think this is fine for the design and results of the experiment, but it seems that some modifications are needed regarding the surrounding contents. Please note the following points and make corrections: From the content of the title and text, there is only the content of how the anesthetic effect is in the case of a specific surgery. Then, the findings obtained from this paper will be extremely limited. If you think that the effect of this anesthetic can be obtained even with more surgery, why not add that? - It is better to add whether the difference between the effects of the two anesthetics is due to the action based on neurotoxicity. - I don't think Fig.1-3 is necessary. For example, it is better to show the amount of pain by area or compare it with the reported reports of other drugs.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	- In "Exclusion Criteria", it is better to describe how the exclusion rules are decided. - In the annotation of Fig.4, there is a description of 1st ..., but please reconsider whether this is correct.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	- Isn't the content at the beginning of the Procedure section (random sampling method) unnecessary?	

### **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:	Jun Kobayashi
Department, University & Country	University of Kochi, Japan