



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_59854
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF DENTAL ANXIETY IN CHILDREN BY ESTIMATING THE SALIVARY CORTISOL LEVELS BEFORE AND AFTER DENTAL PROCEDURES
Type of the Article	Clinical 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy> )



**SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>1. Title</b> should be informative enough, but not so long. It should contain the main idea, which is presented in the manuscript.</p> <p><b>2. Manuscript should be concise.</b> It should not contain known information, described in books or literature.</p> <p><b>3. Experimental methods and methodology are described shortly</b>, only references to given methods or methodology are mentioned.</p> <p><b>4. Tables should be simple, easy to read.</b> They should illustrate the main findings.</p> <p><b>5. Only important findings are mentioned in the results</b>, in the form of clear tables and pictures.</p> <p><b>6. Abstract should be concise</b></p> <p>a) Generally known information about a given issue should not be included in the abstract.</p> <p>b) Methodology and a detailed description of the experiments should not be included in the abstract.</p> <p>c) Not all results should be included in the abstract, only those, which were the reason for writing the manuscript.</p> <p>d) Abstract is not a description of what has been done, neither what was found out. Abstract should contain the enhancement in a given area.</p> <p>e) Conclusion of the abstract should contain the value of the study, new findings, explanations and mainly scientific added value of the manuscript.</p> <p>f) Conclusion of the abstract should clearly describe the main value of the published results. It should not be only a confirmation of the results already published, neither a description of the event or the results of the observation and their comparison. Scientific manuscript should bring an added value to the complex scientific knowledge.</p> <p>g) The main conclusion and scientific contribution is part of the abstract. Not at the end of the manuscript.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The manuscript is too long, with a lot of information that can be find in the books.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The main idea for the manuscript is interesting.	

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Ana Sotirovska Ivkovska
Department, University & Country	University "Ss Cyril and Methodius", Republic of Macedonia