

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84107
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF TEMPERATURE RISE INSIDE PULP CHAMBER USING TWO DIFFERENT PROVISIONAL RESTORATIVE MATERIALS
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.journalprij.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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. Prosthodontic department dental Out patient department laboratory, Liaquat University Hospital Jamshoro. This study will aids in the prevention of future by opting for material will less temperature rise during setting procedure.(Reframe, Grammer)</p> <p>2. Total 60 permanent teeth with sound morphology,usually extracted for orthodontic treatment were selected using non probability consecutive sampling technique.</p> <p>(Teeth used for Study were maxillary central incisor teeth...?)Why Central insicors were extracted for Orthodontic management?)</p> <p>3. Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Mean Rise in Temperature During Provisional Restorations. Mean: (Is Unclear)</p> <p>4. Figure 1. Frequency of Teeth Arch for Provisional Restoration.(Unclear ?- To reframe)</p> <p>In Abstract: Conclusion: The mean rise in pulp temperature using Bis-GMA resin was significantly less as compared to the GMMA material. So Bis-GMA should be preferred over GMMA material for provisional restorations. GMMA???)</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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> 60 Central incisors Extracted for Orthodontic Treatment? Raise an ethical issue?	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pradeep Kumar
Department, University & Country	Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Sciences, India