

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84263
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Cytotoxic Effects of Silver Diamine Fluoride/ Potassium Iodide agent on human peripheral lymphocytes
Type of the Article	Original 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>An abstract is a brief summary (of specified word limit) of the content of the manuscript. It should provide the highlights from the introduction, methods, results, discussion and conclusions (Table 1).</p> <p>The statement of the research question is the most important part of the introduction. The review of the literature needs to be short and concise.</p> <p>Results; The two functions of this section are to report the results (past verb tense) of the procedures described in the methods and to present the evidence that is the data (in the form of text, tables or figures), that supports the results.</p>	<p>Abstract is revised.</p> <p>The null hypothesis as research question is added.</p> <p>Tables and figures supports the results.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Methodology ;</p> <p>This section is descriptive</p> <p>References;</p> <p>Include only the essential references. Cite most accessible reference, and the primary source rather than reviews.</p>	<p>References are revised.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>Discussion;</p> <p>Explanations of any results that do not support the answers, Indication of the originality/uniqueness of the work.</p> <p>Indication of the importance of the work e.g. clinical significance</p>	<p>Discussion part is revised.</p>

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)	