

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84042
Title of the Manuscript:	Organophosphorous compounds in assessment of histomorphological alterations of natural tooth.
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract: I encouraged the author to remove “indeed” from the first sentence. Also, rephrase the last sentence of the abstract. English appears redundant the way it is written.</p> <p>Introduction: in general, when you state a sentence, you should quote a reference. For example, in this sentence “Serious poisonings due to misuse of OP insecticides have been reported for more than four decades”. I suggest quoting a reference.</p> <p>The introduction should contain a gap of the literature. Why is the study performed? Is it for lack of data? Is it because the traditional methods are not efficient? Please, specify. This is the basis why the study has been performed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “In OP poisoning, the conventional approach to clinical features has focused on the muscarinic, nicotinic and central nervous system”: this sentence is incomplete. Signs and symptoms can reflect activation of muscarinic or nicotinic RECEPTORS. The statement without this term does not provide any sense. - “One different approach is the identification of morphological alterations observed in natural tooth which are exposed to OPs for a specified time span”. Can the author provide a cleared indication of what is the “specified time span”? What is the minimum time tooth and Ops should stay in contact to see an effect? - “There are few similar studies that have performed to evaluate the morphological alterations in natural tooth which are exposed to different acids.” please rephrase the sentence. The meaning is obscure in the way it is expressed. - when you explicit an acronymous like Organophosphorous compounds as Ops, the same acronym should be used through the entire manuscript. For example, the author spells out the entire term again before the aim of the study and in the material and methods. However, the acronym should be utilized consistently. <p>Materials: what is the final sample size of teeth?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - remove “unfortunately” from all the manuscript. The authors should be unbiased in reporting their results and conclusion. - please, to achieve a better understanding of the dental change, provide the description of the “normality” <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where there any difference between teeth with one root, two roots or three-four roots? Where there any difference comparing age of maturation of the teeth? <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “The oral cavity was studied and the most common signs found were thickening of the oral mucous membranes with slight whitish discoloration and moderate to severe white discoloration with the attached gingival.” do the authors indicate the results of OP on oral cavity according to other studies? IN this case, rephrase for a better understanding and provide a reference. - “Previous evidences reveal that OP compounds are proven to have effects of the oral soft tissues yet the effect on the oral hard tissues have not been proved.” please provide a reference - “ The number of hypocalcified structures, notably the enamel lamellae, was significantly higher in teeth immersed in OP compounds than in teeth not exposed to OP compounds”. 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>Here the author refer to a “control group”. Did the author selected extracted teeth for comparison? Or is the author referring to basic knowledge on dental anatomy, histopathology?</p> <p>- in the discussion, the author should compare the data obtained by the present study with the ones mentioned in the introduction that tried to do the same procedures on the teeth.</p> <p>Conclusion: In a scientific article, you cannot put any qualitative personal connotation (such as in this case “unfortunately”). Moreover, please, rephrase the last part of the sentence in a more logical manner (like, “therefore the suggested method of identification of poisoning was not proven to be reliable and applicable within crime investigation”)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Introduction: Remove acronym that you are not going to repeat anymore through the manuscript (e.g. CNS).</p> <p>Material and methods: move the paragraph of the sample selection right after you explain where the teeth come from. - where all the teeth immersed in the solution together? - what do you mean by “physically the tooth’s structure have not been altered”?</p> <p>Discussion: - “ More than enamel tufts and spindles made up the enamel lamellae” Please, rephrase. the sentence is obscure in its meaning. - I would omit the paragraph of the increased bacteria and caries penetrating the increased amount of enamel lamellae. This methods is suggested as an additional tool to detect potential poisoning in forensic field. As they are teeth of a cadaver, I would not be so concerned about detection of caries-causing bacteria and cavities. (“Caries-causing bacteria can enter the dentine-enamel junction via the enamel lamellae, which have been shown to be permeable”), unless the author believes that detecting caries may also increase the ability to recognize a poisoning.</p> <p>Reference: the author should be consistent with the format of the citations.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Linda Sangalli</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Kentucky, United Sates</p>