

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83114
Title of the Manuscript:	“Direct Sinus augmentation procedure for rehabilitation of severely atrophic posterior maxilla with sticky bone – A case report”
Type of the Article	Case 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1) Period of post-operative follow-up of the patient is too less to evaluate the clinical and radiographic effect of the mentioned approach. 2) Clinical evidence/ pictures related to the placement of PRF membrane and its stabilization is to be provided.	The present report only enumerates the technique for direct sinus lift using sticky bone, not to evaluate the clinical and radiographic effect only .However in view of vast experience of the authors using this technique, it has been very effective and has been backed by the literature mentioned in this present study and follow up of present case is also been documented for effectiveness . Clinical picture related to PRF is included and mentioned in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1) In introduction, scientific description of need for bone augmentation along with sinus lift is insufficient. 2) Citation of several articles in introduction and discussion is not provided in references. 3) In discussion, critical appraisal of present methodology is insufficient (benefits/ demerits). 4) There is no relevance of a reference in conclusion.	Has been included Has been included Has been included Has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The presented report is good from a clinical point of view. However the manuscript presentation needs betterment in terms of organisation and clinical analysis.	Has been modified and corrected

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