

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_84195
Title of the Manuscript:	Finite element analysis of biomechanical behaviour of remaining coronal dentin in endodontically restored tooth - a systematic review [evaluation of stress distribution in fea studies]
Type of the Article	Review 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>This is the first draft of a review that have the potential to be a Systematic Review Materials and methods should be improved with better description of inclusion and exclusion criteria. Authors should use MESH terms for key-words, or justify why not using it. Only 22 references are not enough to allow a better understanding of this topic. Reference 17 is a literature review and must not be included in the analysis A risk of bias must be performed in the included manuscripts Authors quote to many contents of the literature without including the references after statements, mainly in discussion. Authors have to include a limitation section in discussion. Similarity index too high. There some mistakes in grammar that should be addressed.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Tables are not tables since they are laterally closed In the text of the manuscript: “Primary output methods utilized by the reviewed studies are enumerated in Tables 1–3.” There is no table 3</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>this draft (“Finite element analysis of biomechanical behaviour...”) should be entirely rewritten before submission</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:	Daniel Humberto Pozza
Department, University & Country	Universidade do Porto, Portugal