SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_50988**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Megaliths: a Literature review of giant salivary sialoliths**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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	**Abstract:** Conclusion is not proper with the purpose of this literature study manuscript as described within the content of this manuscript, therefore need to be added with the method of diagnose and treatment. The statement of ... The decision to find and search for reported giant salivary stones larger than 30 mm was taken and the articles of giant sialoliths reported in the range of 15 to 30 mm were not included in this study ...> not proper with the content described in this manuscript such as .. And 86 megaliths with a size of 30 mm and upper were reported. The advantage of the radiolucent sialoliths can be seen with it.disadvantage → not clear, need to be described The manner to write the content of this manuscript need to be restructued such as **Treatment**: (Refer to figure 9)... the figure need to be replaced after the related description **The manuscript is too long (30 pages) →** need to be shorten, such as content that already described in form of statements no need to be formulated in form of feagure. More proper just described in feagures. **Conclusion:** not proper with the data described within the manuscript**.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		sc

SDI 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:	***Janti Sudiono***
Department, University & Country	***Trisakti University, Indonesia***