



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_59751
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE STUDY ON EFFECTIVENESS OF OIL PULLING AND MOUTHWASH
Type of the Article	Survey

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://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/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		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Minor grammatical and typo errors are present in the text. Together with that, some colloquial language traits could be removed as well. 2) The reference "Monsen, R. (No date)" should be correctly addressed in the reference list or excluded from the manuscript. In a fast research on the internet, the study is a poster presented at the 16th World Congress of the European Association for Palliative Care, maybe others studies could bring more reliable information to the study. I suggest to remove this reference from this study. 3) On the Materials And Methods, the survey method and the questions of the questionnaire should be presented on the study, Together with that, data on the respondents should be presented, as the authors refers them as students, however the degree and eligibility process are not mentioned. 4) On the discussion, the authors should discuss the advantages and future possibilities of the use of the oil pulling. Maybe a topic should be discussed as the oil pulling could be an alternative to the pharmaceuticals and mouthwashes. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The title does not fully represent how the study is designed. I suggest to add the "A single center study". 2) The conclusion should be stronger, proposing a intervention to expand the knowledge of the use of the oil pulling. 	



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:	Samuel Macedo Costa
Department, University & Country	Hospital João XXIII, Brazil