

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82205
Title of the Manuscript:	Aerosol Contamination in The Dental Operatory During Oral Prophylaxis: An Occupational Hazard.
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.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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author didn't mention the ethical approval. • The sample very small and the method of selection this sample size did not mention In this cross-sectional study as mentioned earlier how the sample size had been chosen and according to what? • Any written consent taken from the patient to participate in this study • No inclusion & exclusion criteria for patient selection mentioned • No details regarding the age group or gender and medical status • No significance or p value recorded 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study type , location & duration should be written in methodology section • The result section should be separated from discussion • The results table for all the 5 patients or just one. • Discussion part need to be extended • No comparison of the results of this study with other studies in the discussion • The conclusion Need to be extended and express the findings from the results • There is no conflict of interest declaration 	
Optional/General comments	<p>The paper will be better if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. larger sample size included 2. compared with other methods to detect the contamination (double arm study) 3. the way of discussion become more specific and precise 	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Nawras Maher Mostafa
Department, University & Country	Iraq