

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79025
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and attitude of dental students and practitioners towards virtual reality based technologies in Central India: A cross sectional survey
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.journalipri.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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Is the questionnaire directly used from Sabalic M et al, 2017? If it was modified kindly detail the validation process. Was permission for the use of the questionnaire sought?2. Specify inclusion criteria3. Your study seems to be a KAP type of stud. However your title indicates only Knowledge and attitudes measured.4. What is the sampling method? How were the participants recruited / contacted?5. Add statements regarding informed consent administered.6. Analysis of gender and postgraduation should be presented7. (17) If yes, which course(s) were you taught about virtual reality-based technologies?.. Add analysis of responses to this question.8. In the introduction kindly specify how dental practice is different in India as compared to other countries where identical surveys have been conducted.9. What are your recommendations based on your survey results?	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The permission for use was sought2. Inclusion criteria: All dental practitioners qualified to practice and students admitted in dental colleges. Inclusion criteria were independent of institute, gender, graduation year and curriculum content.3. Title changed accordingly4. Sampling method added5. Information regarding informed consent mentioned in the manuscript6. Analysis of gender and post graduation speciality added7. Response to the courses that taught about VRBT added8. Changes made in introduction9. Added in manuscript- According to the overall analysis, the attitude of respondents was positive but the knowledge and implementation could be considered insufficient which can be attributed to the disadvantage of high cost. The clinical practice could be benefited if the current education programmes impart knowledge about VRBT's. The routine use of such technologies can elevate the outcomes surpassing few disadvantages of traditional techniques.
Minor REVISION comments	Kindly check spelling and grammar. Stimulators should be replaced with simulator	Spellings checked replaced stimulators with simulator
Optional/General comments	A good initiative into KAP of virtual reality which is the future of skills training.	

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)	No ethical issues noted, clearance obtained from institutional ethical committee