

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_82380
Title of the Manuscript:	A Retrospective Comparative Study of Cone-Beam Computed Tomography versus Rendered Panoramic Images in Identifying the Presence, Types and Characteristics of Dens Invaginatus in Patients presenting to Qassim university.
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.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. Type of study? (retrospective comparative/ title should be clear, precise and specific) 2. Topic is interesting but writing is boring and too long; try to write it precisely to the point. 3. Site of 302 DI? Each quadrant and anterior / posterior wise? In males & females? 4. Inclusion and exclusion criteria?? How u justify image quality of cbct? All images of cbct saved have acceptable quality, hw u differentiate b/w good n bad quality n this study? 5. Re write the results, discussion part. 6. Discussion should include "positive, negative studies followed by controversies ... followed by comparison with ur study results in every paragraph. Give suitable explanation of link between teeth size and gender (if any?) 7. Then discuss how there is link/ no link based on avl. evidence. Start background with link between teeth size/ shape with gender / specific study parameter. 8. How parental lineages (maternal side n paternal side) contribute to teeth size n shape?? DI is anomaly compared to natural teeth hw would it be linked? 9. More supporting studies, as lots of research already been done on this topics 10. Any limitations of the study?? 11. Clinical relevance of this study? 12. Acknowledgement, COI , Funding 13. What is the use and benefit of this study? Message for dentists from this study? 14. Keywords? Revise the abstract 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retrospective cohort 2. Title is re-written 3. Clarified in the first three tables 4. Poor quality was identified using this criteria (1) divergence of x-ray beam, (2) numerous inherent flat-panel detector-based artifacts. 5. Results and discussion are re-written. 6. More insights are provided in the discussion section. 7. Statistical analysis has been done to clarify the link. 8. This was not the aim of the study. 9. More studies are added to the article. 10. Clarified in the discussion section. 11. Clarified in the introduction section. 12. None funding 13. Message of the study is presented in the conclusion 14. Keywords added.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add justified captions to the tables 	All tables are captioned
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Macrodontia, Hypodontia, Oligodontia, Taurodontism, Generation , Fusion, Supernumerary teeth , Amelogenesis imperfecta , Invagination in an odontome , Multiple odontomes, Coronal agenesis and William's syndrome. <p>References??</p>	

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>	