

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_76772
Title of the Manuscript:	Community members' and Dentists' perceptions for treatment seeking behavior regarding management of oral diseases in an underprivileged area:A Qualitative study
Type of the Article	Research article, qualitative

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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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	<p>El titulo menciona tratamiento, y en el resumen hablan sobre el manejo farmacologico y uso de antibioticos, por lo que sugiero especificarlo, ya que al colocar "tratamiento" abarca tanto medico / farmacologico como quirurgico y adyuvantes o combinacion de these.</p> <p>The methodology is not specific either in the abstract or in the text, it is suggested to mention the type of research, how they collected data, from where they obtained that database that they mention, if it was a review (systematic or methodological).</p> <p>It seems that the study has bias, when making a compilation of the perception of the people in its sample and not handling an instrument or a scale to be able to determine and explain the results, the study is too subjective, it is not serious, it seems to me that it will use "yes / no" questions, but maybe if the statistics improved, this revision would be more meaningful.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The discussion is not an extension of the results, nor is it an explanation of the results. But to carry out an analysis, debate, comparison, discussion of what was obtained with the limitations that they presented or coincidences with what the literature or other authors or studies reports, highlighting the importance or why your article is different or worth it.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The subject is not new, there are already articles about it, perhaps if the author specified or gave it a different touch, it would make it more attractive</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alejandra Giselle Juárez Rebollar
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México