

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81723
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF OSTEOMYELITIS AMONG PATIENTS VISITING PRIVATE DENTAL HOSPITAL - An Institutional study
Type of the Article	An 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>)

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>TITLE - title of the manuscript is confusing as “osteomyelitis” is a very general condition meaning the infection of the bone. However, the authors’ main focus is actually on the OM cases in a dental hospital. Suggest being more specific on the title.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION - It is strongly discourage that author cite their own publications without any relevance to the content of current manuscript. Kindly remove the references from number 19 to 38.</p> <p>METHODS - Over a year in the hospital, there is only 5 OM cases from 535,951 cases which accounts for 0.0009%. This extremely low percentage and number of cases could not provide any statistically significant results - If the author would like to highlight the importance of OM cases in the hospital, it is recommended that author should do a case series on these 5 cases and explain in details on the patients instead. A generalization of the cases with such low number provide little significant to the readers. - Author should further elaborate on the ethics application of this study. Since it is a study using patients’ information, ethical approval is necessary</p> <p>RESULTS - 20% in this case basically only mean 1 case. The relatively low number of samples include in this study make the percentage presented of no significant relevant and can be misleading to the readers - Suggest authors to either change the format of reporting to “case series” or “case reports” or authors should expand the study and include several more hospitals with additional samples to make it a multi-center study. - With extremely low number of samples in this study, presenting the data in bar chart is not significantly useful. The data can be easily summarized into a table instead of 4 different charts - Discussion on the results of the study should be further elaborated. The comparison of this study with the previous studies is poorly relevant due to the extremely low sample size of this study. Author should discuss in depth on the OM's features and management to interest the readers</p> <p>LIMITATIONS - Author wrote that they could not retrieve the data records completely and could not ensure an exact number of OM cases. Authors should actually present how they retrieve the data in the “Methods” and address this issue and elaborate on how many cases are actually excluded from the study.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS - Author suggest the “incidence of OM is high among the patients in Chennai regions” which actually accounts for 0.0009%. So, what is the standard or expected percentage in general? 0.0009% doesn't seems to be a large number.</p> <p>REFERENCES - Why is the references from number 19 to number 38 specifically highlighted? A double blinded review should strongly discourage such action of trying to reveal the authors' identity.</p>	<p>The following title has been changed.</p> <p>The following correction have been done</p> <p>The following corrections are done and ethical approval details mentioned.</p> <p>The following corrections are done.</p> <p>The following corrections are done.</p> <p>The following corrections are done.</p> <p>Following references are removed.</p>

Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	N/A	
Optional/General comments	- In general, author is having a satisfactory command of English. Minor grammar mistakes could be detected. Suggest author to do proof-reading prior to submission.	

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?	<p><u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u></p> <p>Yes. Ethical approval to publish the data was not seek from any national body or official institution. Since the authors are dealing with patients' data, privacy and confidentiality of the data should be secured, however, no information was elaborated on this in the manuscript</p>	Ethical approval details were mentioned in manuscript