Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_83683**
Title of the Manuscript:	**THE PATTERN OF OCCLUSAL CONTACT IN LATERAL MANDIBULAR JAW POSITION**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Introduction.** The introduction should be improved to provide sufficient background and include all relevant and up-to-date references and abbreviations. The research problem is important and current, but it should be presented in a clearer way, including an international vision from the most general to the most specific in relation to the objective. The social, economic, physical impact should be named**.** **Objective**: The objective should be separated from the hypothesis. **Method**: it is not clear: types of variables, the type of sampling, the validity of the form, reliability of the observers, the steps of the data collection procedure. Confidentiality and anonymity in data collection, analysis and custody are not mentioned. The type of statistical analysis or the programs used are not mentioned. **Results.** The text is not presented clearly, sometimes the same information is repeated in the text and tables. It would be necessary to select the most appropriate type of graph. **Discussion.** Method information is repeated. Similar studies discussed are out of date and scarce. There is no difference between the facts(findings), the author's opinion on the facts and finally that of other studies. Excess figures, percentages and statements. Absence of limitations, strengths or possible future research. **References:** Update recommended. There is only one reference from the year 2020.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I want to congratulate the authors on the subject of the manuscript. In my opinion, I found the study very interesting, and I think the topic is very necessary. The manuscript is written in an understandable way and contains in each section the most relevant aspects of the research. However, the manuscript must make some important revisions.	

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:	**Francisco Miguel Escandell Rico**
Department, University & Country	**University of Alicante, Spain**