SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_53721**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Cone-beam computed tomography guidance in functional endoscopic sinus surgery: a retrospective cohort study**
Type of the Article	**Original 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	**The authors report a case serie of CBCT guided endonasal surgery, evaluating satisfaction of the surgeon and complication rate. The study was approved by the local ethic commission.** **The study is well designed, aims are clear and methods are in accordance to the objectives.** **The results are well exposed, discussion exposes relevant literature regarding CBCT vs CT, and indications of FESS.** **My only suggestion is to use only one abbreviation: either ESS or (better as more frequently used) FESS. Also, I would suggest changing "navigation", as the word confounds to intra-operative navigation imaging, what was not the case. The CBCT was done preoperatively to perform identification of anatomy of each patient.**	The manuscript has been thoroughly modified
Minor REVISION comments	none	
Optional/General comments		

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)*	