



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_59854
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF DENTAL ANXIETY IN CHILDREN BY ESTIMATING THE SALIVARY CORTISOL LEVELS BEFORE AND AFTER DENTAL PROCEDURES
Type of the Article	Clinical study

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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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>1. Title should be informative enough, but not so long. It should contain the main idea, which is presented in the manuscript.</p> <p>2. Manuscript should be concise. It should not contain known information, described in books or literature.</p> <p>3. Experimental methods and methodology are described shortly, only references to given methods or methodology are mentioned.</p> <p>4. Tables should be simple, easy to read. They should illustrate the main findings.</p> <p>5. Only important findings are mentioned in the results, in the form of clear tables and pictures.</p> <p>6. Abstract should be concise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Generally known information about a given issue should not be included in the abstract. b) Methodology and a detailed description of the experiments should not be included in the abstract. c) Not all results should be included in the abstract, only those, which were the reason for writing the manuscript. d) Abstract is not a description of what has been done, neither what was found out. Abstract should contain the enhancement in a given area. e) Conclusion of the abstract should contain the value of the study, new findings, explanations and mainly scientific added value of the manuscript. f) Conclusion of the abstract should clearly describe the main value of the published results. It should not be only a confirmation of the results already published, neither a description of the event or the results of the observation and their comparison. Scientific manuscript should bring an added value to the complex scientific knowledge. g) The main conclusion and scientific contribution is part of the abstract. Not at the end of the manuscript. 	<p>All the suggested correction have been done</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments	The manuscript is too long, with a lot of information that can be find in the books.	Noted
Optional/General comments	The main idea for the manuscript is interesting.	Ok

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	