## Review Form 1.6

| | |
|---|---|
| Journal Name: | **Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International** |
| Manuscript Number: | **Ms_JPRI_79806** |
| Title of the Manuscript: | **KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE OF DENTAL PRACTITIONERS TOWARDS SCREENING FOR ORAL PRE-CANCER AND CANCER** |
| 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.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 | It is an important and relevant study, but important information is lacking in the methodology: how was the sample selected to reach a total of 100 professionals from academic institutions and the private area? Do they sign a consent form? Was the research submitted to the research ethics committee?<br>Is the questionnaire used validated? Or was it created and pilot tested? What is the period in which the questionnaires were applied?<br>It is necessary to improve the description of the methodology so that the research can be evaluated in relation to the publication. | |
| **Minor** REVISION comments | It is necessary to improve the description of the methodology so that research can be evaluated in relation to the publication. | |
| **Optional/General**comments | It is an important and relevant study, but important information is lacking in the methodology: how was the sample selected to reach a total of 100 professionals from academic institutions and the private area? Do they sign a consent form? Was the research submitted to the research ethics committee?<br>Is the questionnaire used validated? Or was it created and pilot tested? What is the period in which the questionnaires were applied?<br>It is necessary to improve the description of the methodology so that the research can be evaluated in relation to the publication. | |

## Review Form 1.6

**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)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Rosa Maria Eid Weiler** |
| Department, University & Country | **Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Brazil** |